

THE DUBLIN REVIEW

July to December, 1942

Half-Yearly Vol. 211

Nos. 422 & 423

LONDON
BURNS OATES AND
WASHBOURNE LTD.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW

July to December, 1942

Vol. 12, No. 43

July 1942, Vol. 12, No. 43

WASHTON
BURNS OATES AND
LONDON

CONTENTS

JULY, AUGUST, SEPTEMBER,

1942

	PAGE
Christian Freedom	
By Christopher Dawson	1
Japanese and Germans	
By Arthur Wilson	8
The Index of the Body	
By Charles Williams	13
Business Practice and the Common Good	
By J. L. Benvenisti	20
Religious Poetry in Modern Spain	
By Romanus Rios, O.S.B.	30
Erasmus in England	
By W. E. Campbell	36
St. Hildegard	
By H. C. Graef	49
Catholicism and the Reform of Social Insurance	
By Hermann Levy	55
Mediaeval Village Life	
By J. A. Roderick	58
Psycho-Analysis and Catholic Thought	
By Charles Burns	64

Some Recent Books - - - - - 70

ROME AND THE COUNTER REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. MASTERS OF POLITICAL THOUGHT. MEDIAEVAL LIBRARIES OF GREAT BRITAIN—A LIST OF SURVIVING BOOKS. THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY AND THE BRITISH EMPIRE: VOL. II. CANADA: AMERICA'S PROBLEM. HOW STRONG IS AMERICA? A BRIEF HISTORY AND THE UNITED STATES. THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH AND THE UNITED STATES IN THE POST-WAR WORLD (PEACE AIMS PAMPHLET NO. 10). THE DIFFUSION OF ENGLISH CULTURE. A SHORT HISTORY OF MODERN GREECE. GREAT BRITAIN AND CHINA, AND JAPAN AND THE MODERN WORLD (OXFORD PAMPHLETS ON WORLD AFFAIRS, NOS. 58 AND 55). CHINA THROUGH CATHOLIC EYES. A CHRISTIAN BASIS FOR THE POST-WAR WORLD: A COMMENTARY ON THE TEN PEACE POINTS. CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL ORDER. THE MORAL BLITZ. NEW ENGLAND: INDIAN SUMMER, 1865-1915. SELECTED POEMS. POEMS IN LATIN: TOGETHER WITH A FEW INSCRIPTIONS. EPITAPH FOR EUROPE. A TALE OF TEN CITIES. THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM.

CONTENTS

OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, DECEMBER,

1942

	PAGE
The Foundations of Unity	
By Christopher Dawson	97
In Face of the World Crisis: Manifesto of European Catholics Resident in North America	105
The Catholic Origins of the English Tradition	
By J. J. Saunders	115
The Benedictines in Poland	
By Romanus Rios, O.S.B.	126
Enoch and His Angels	
By Mrs. E. Wyatt	134
Brentano and the Prussian Tradition	
By Werner J. Milch	141
Joseph de Maistre and His Daughters	
By Mrs. G. Norman	149
Some Recent Books	158

THE PRESENT AGE. SPANISH ROMANESQUE ARCHITECTURE OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY. SOCIALISM, NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL. IS MODERN CULTURE DOOMED? IMMORTALITY. THE GOSPEL OF THE INFANCY. THE SCREWTAPE LETTERS. THE WOOL TRADE IN ENGLISH MEDIAEVAL HISTORY. GERMAN WITH TEARS. A THOUSAND SHALL FALL. STALIN UND DAS EWIGE RUSSLAND. KING ALFONSO. GERMANY IN PERIL. THE SHAKESPEARIAN TEMPEST. CHARIOT OF WRATH. THE CLASSICS AND THE MAN OF LETTERS. COLLECTED POEMS. FRIEDRICH HÖLDERLIN: GEDICHTE. JOSEPH CONRAD. ALL THE DAY LONG. AND THE FLOODS CAME. IMMORTAL SERGEANT. ADVISORY BODIES. TOPICS. THE FOOL'S PROGRESS.

The Dublin Review

JULY, 1942

No. 422

CHRISTIAN FREEDOM

AMONG so many fundamental things that are being called in question by the present world crisis none is more important than the issue of religious freedom. No one can doubt that it is in danger today in many countries and from many causes, and it is an urgent necessity that all Christians should become fully conscious of the changed situation. In this country and in America it is, perhaps, exceptionally difficult to do so, because religious freedom has been accepted for so long as a matter of course that it has become commonplace. It may even be felt that we have had too much of it, as we have had too much economic freedom, so that it is responsible for the loss of a clear sense of objective spiritual truth. But religious freedom is not the same thing as spiritual disorder, and, as the Pope has said in his Jubilee address a few weeks ago, the danger to religious freedom is at the same time a call to Christian unity.

It is no longer possible to defend religious freedom on the basis of nineteenth-century individualism and spiritual *laissez-faire*—a basis which was, in fact, never acceptable to Catholic tradition. What is at stake is the very existence of Christianity in a world hostile to Christ. "The new conditions have nothing in common with the learned controversies of the past"; they are like those which the early Church had to face, so that "today Christians are being reproached for the same offences against the law as those for which Peter and Paul were reproached by the Caesars of the first century".*

At first sight it seems as though the conditions under which the Church existed at that period made any kind of religious freedom impossible. But in fact this was not so. By a spiritual law of compensation the external pressure of persecution and proscription strengthened the sense of interior liberation and spiritual freedom which was so characteristic of primitive Christianity. For freedom is not something exterior to religion—in a profound sense *Christianity is freedom*, and the words which have become canonized and set apart as the classical terms of Christian theology—redemption, salvation, ἀπολύτωση, ἐξαγοδίσειν, σωτηρία—possessed for their original hearers the simple and immediate sense of the delivery of a slave and the release of a captive.

* Broadcast of Pius XII on 12 May, 1942,
Vol. 211

It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of the concepts of freedom and slavery in the thought of the ancient world. The society of the ancient world was built on the institution of slavery, as that of the modern world is built on capital and labour, and the wars and confiscations of the first century B.C. had both increased its extent and destroyed its traditional character, so that men of education and culture, the very opposite of Aristotle's "natural slaves", might find themselves reduced by some accident of world politics to a state of subhuman rightlessness. And behind this condition of personal servitude, which was the framework of social life, there were the traditions of corporate national servitude which formed Jewish thought in a pattern of social dualism.

The two cities—Babylon and Jerusalem—were the archetypes of this spiritual tradition; on the one hand, the predatory world empire or slave state which was the embodiment of human pride and power, on the other the holy community which was the representative of God's purpose in the world and the guardian of the Divine Law. For centuries the holy community had been a captive and an exile under the hard yoke of successive world empires, and the whole spiritual energy of Israel was concentrated on the hope of deliverance, the return of the exiles from their captivity and the coming of the Kingdom of God and of His people.

The Gospel of Christ was essentially the good news of the coming of the Kingdom, but at the same time it raised the whole idea of redemption and deliverance to a new plane. It was no longer a question of national deliverance by the establishment of a social or political theocracy. It was the reversal of a universal cosmic process which had reduced the whole human race to a state of slavery. It was a moral deliverance, but it was also much more than that. We are so accustomed to the traditional Christian terminology of sin and redemption that we are apt to forget what these words meant to the early Christians. For to them sin was not simply unethical behaviour, it was a real state of slavery to powers outside humanity and stronger than man, the spiritual forces of evil which were the rulers of this dark age.

Modern writers, like Schweitzer and Warneck, have described almost precisely the same conceptions and the same psychological attitude among converts from paganism in the world today. The latter writes: "The insurmountable wall that rises up between the heathen and God is not sin, as among ourselves; it is the kingdom of darkness in which they are bound. That bondage shows itself in the fear that surrounds them:

fear of souls, fear of spirits, fear of human enemies and magicians. The Gospel comes to unloose these bonds. It stands forth before their eyes as a delivering power, a redemption."^{*}

Thus humanity left to its own resources has no freedom and no power to free itself. It is involved in a progressive state of disorder which is at once physical and metaphysical, moral, social and political. This is quite a different conception from the Calvinist doctrine of the total depravity and reprobation of human nature, though the latter, of course, based itself on the same literary tradition and made use of the same theological language. But the view of the New Testament is based on a vision of a cosmic situation, while that of the Reformers is a theological theory based on *a priori* reasoning. The solidarity of mankind under the reign of evil is not an abstraction, it is a fact of experience, which has been recognized by philosophers and religious thinkers of every age from the time of Buddha to our own days. To quote a modern example, Tolstoy writes: "People bound together by a delusion form as it were a collective cohesive mass. The cohesion of that mass is the evil of the world. All the spiritual activity of humanity is directed towards the destruction of this cohesion. All revolutions are attempts to break up that mass by violence. It seems to people that if they break up that mass, it will cease to be a mass; and therefore they strike at it; but by trying to break it, they only force it closer. The cohesion of the particles is not destroyed, until the inner form passes from the mass to the particles and obliges them to separate from it."[†]

Now the Gospel is the record of the dramatic irruption of Divine power into this closed order. "Now is the judgement of the world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out" (John xii, 31). The prince of this world is like a strong man guarding his house by force of arms, until a stronger than he comes and conquers him and takes away the armaments in which he put his trust (John xi, 21-2). Thus the Redemption is the turning-point in the history of humanity and inaugurates a vital process of liberation which is destined to integrate humanity in a new spiritual solidarity. The old world remains, superficially its power and its cohesion are unaffected, but under the surface a new vital process is at work, and men have only to adhere to this new principle of life to be freed from the immense and complicated burden of hereditary evil and to be reborn. "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.

^{*} Warneck, *The Living Forces of the Gospel*, p. 232.

[†] *What I Believe* (World's Classics ed.), p. 389.

Old things are passed away. Behold all things have become new" (2 Cor. v). "Awake thou that sleepest and arise from the dead and Christ shall shine upon thee."

It was from this total psychological point of view that the Christian of the first century conceived the idea of freedom. Freedom was inseparable from Redemption. It was something entirely independent of external circumstances, a divine gift which the powers of this world could not limit or destroy. "If the Son shall make you free, you are free indeed." "Where the Spirit of God is, there is freedom."

Yet, on the other hand, it was also power. It flowed forth into the world, creating a new bond of community and overcoming the physical and social barriers that stood in its way, so that even fundamental differences of race and class and personal status were transcended and appeared insignificant. It was, in fact, a new kind of freedom that was entirely different from the civic freedom of the Greek city state which had been the dominant social ideal of the ancient world, though it sometimes made use of the same terminology. Nevertheless it was undoubtedly an effective freedom, something which really delivered men from real evils and servitudes and which transformed man and society, more completely than any political revolution has ever done.

Christian freedom entered the world as something Divine and miraculous. "The blind see, the lepers are cleansed, the poor have the Gospel preached to them." It is essentially theocentric—God-given and in no way dependent on human rights or human powers. It is an emancipation from the servitudes that seem to be the natural condition of human nature and an admission into the glorious liberty of the children of God. Yet it does not mean a withdrawal from social and physical reality like Buddhist asceticism and Neoplatonic mysticism which were also conceived as ways of deliverance. It was essentially a world-transforming power, and it manifested this power from the beginning in the creation of a new community and new forms of social action. Never, in fact, have individual and social consciousness been more completely identified than in the early Church. Christian freedom was from the beginning embodied in the life of a community, and the individual could only possess it in fellowship as a member of the new society which was more than a society, since it was a true spiritual organism, the divine body of the new humanity.

Nevertheless in spite of its mystical and transcendental aspects this society was conceived as the continuation and fulfilment of the Jewish community. In the ancient Paschal liturgy, the

Church prays that "all the nations of the world may become the children of Abraham and partakers of the dignity of Israel", and in fact the historic vicissitudes of this particular people became the archetypes of Christian spiritual experience. The consequence of this is that every Christian people possesses a double tradition and a double citizenship, and this duality is reflected in the Western conception of freedom, which even in its most secular form depends half-consciously on spiritual values that belong to the common inheritance of Israel and Christendom.

This inheritance of the tradition of Israel with its consciousness of social continuity and separateness was, however, combined with a sense of liberation from tradition which finds such a clear and even revolutionary expression in St. Paul's attitude to the Law. There has never been a more drastic indictment of religious traditionalism in its external negative and repressive aspects than that of St. Paul. Nothing that modern rationalists and humanists have said about religion as the enemy of freedom is stronger than St. Paul's picture of the miserable state of humanity labouring under the bondage of the Law. "The yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." Even the high spiritual vocation of Israel did not save the chosen people from this bondage. They were the children of Agar the slave woman who was the archetype of Jerusalem "that now is, and is in slavery with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is our mother. We are not the children of the slave, but of the free, by the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free".*

But to St. Paul the Law was not merely the yoke that enslaves, it was also the barrier that divided the Jews from the rest of humanity. The Jews, though under the Law, had their privileged position as the people of God. The Gentiles were free from the Law, but they were left without God and without spiritual hope. The great fact of the redemption was the breaking down of this barrier and the uniting of the two peoples in the unity of spiritual freedom. "For Christ is our peace who made both one and broke down the middle wall of partition . . . in order to create in himself of the two One New Man."† Therefore the Gentiles were no longer foreigners and exiles, but fellow citizens with the saints and of the household of God. One living temple founded on Christ, and built up by the apostles and prophets as a house for God in the Spirit.

Christian freedom has its beginning and end in this creative act of redemption and reconciliation. It is not the creation of human power and will, but the birthright of the Christian as

* Gal. iv.

† Eph. ii.

child of God, reborn in Christ and vivified by the spirit. It is therefore a much more fundamental thing than what we commonly understand by religious freedom. In modern times Christian freedom has usually been considered in reference either to the freedom of the individual conscience against external compulsion or to the freedom of the Christian community—the Church—against the state. But the first freedom from which these are derivative and dependent is the freedom of the Spirit—the new creation which changes man's nature and liberates him from the state of psychological and moral bondage to the world and the forces that rule the world.

Now this essential spiritual freedom can be expressed in two ways—intellectually as the result of the enlightenment of divine truth—"you shall hear the truth and the truth shall make you free"—or vitally as the communication of divine life—a new birth which transforms human nature by the infusion of the Spirit.

This twofold relation is especially clearly marked in the Johannine writings. Both the Gospel and the First Epistle of St. John equally insist that the communication of Divine Life is made at once by the hearing of a Word and by the society of a Person, and Word and Person were substantially one.

That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and our hands have handled of the Word of life. . . .

That which we have seen and have heard we declare unto you that you also may have fellowship with us, and our fellowship may be with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ.*

The true freedom of the world—the only freedom that can free man in the depths of his personality—depends on keeping open the channel of revelation, preserving the Word of Truth and communicating the Spirit of Life. These are the essential Christian freedoms, and it is for this that the Christian Church as a visible institution exists. If the channel becomes choked or the bridge broken, the world falls back into darkness and chaos and humanity once more becomes bound in that state of slavery which the ancient world saw as an impersonal chain of necessity but which Christian tradition conceived in terms of active personal evil as the Kingdom of Satan.

It is this wholesale loss of spiritual freedom that is the real danger that faces the world today. The plain fact which we see displayed before our eyes is that the power of man has grown so great that it has denied and shut out the power of

* I John i, 3.

the Spirit and that consequently it is destroying the world. We have seen how the new totalitarian orders all tend to become closed orders—spiritual as well as economic autarchies which leave no room for true Christian freedom. And we have no reason to suppose that a new democratic order which bases itself on the ideals of technocracy and economic planning would be fundamentally different in this respect, even though it avoids the grosser evils of the existing totalitarian systems. In so far as this is so, all these new orders are orders of death.

In face of this great danger Christianity still stands as the hope of the world. It is true that Christendom is weakened and divided. At first sight it seems like a valley of dry bones, the dry bones of dead controversies and moribund traditions, since Christians are more tied to the dead past, more dependent on antiquated modes of thought, more wedded to the old social and political order than the rest of the world. There is hardly a social abuse or an intellectual fallacy that has not found its stoutest defenders in the ranks of Christian orthodoxy. Nevertheless, in spite of all this, Christianity is still a living force in the modern world. It has still the promise of new life and spiritual freedom as at the beginning. It may be difficult to see how this promise is to be realized under modern conditions. In fact if we could foresee the future of Christendom and plan out exactly what was to be done, we should be missing the essential nature of Christian freedom. What we can say, however, is that the nature of the new forces that threaten to enslave humanity will inevitably tend to make both Christians and non-Christians conscious of the essential truths of faith and spiritual reality on which the Church stands. The rise of the new totalitarian systems and ideologies is a religious as well as a political revolution. It destroys the traditional division of life into separate secular and religious spheres. It attempts to unify human life and to organize the total psychic and material energies of the community for common ends. And consequently it marks the end of the four centuries of religious development which followed the Reformation—a period that was characterized by the progressive individualization of consciousness, by religious separation and division and by the identification of spiritual freedom with religious individualism. The totalitarian revolution reverses this tendency and leaves no room for any kind of individualism, either secular or religious.

But it goes further than that and attacks spiritual freedom itself. It is therefore vital that Christians should not allow themselves to become confused and divided on this fundamental issue. Christians are agreed that the spiritual anarchy of unbridled

individualism is contrary to the whole Christian tradition of faith and order, however much they may differ in their definitions. But on the other hand they must be still more united in defending the vital principles of Christian freedom which is the fundamental law of spiritual action. For what we are defending are not only man's rights but the rights of God. If the channels are closed by which the word of Christ and the power of the Spirit are communicated to man corporately and individually, the world must fall back into the state of darkness and slavery which Christ came to destroy. It is, of course, true that the opposition and conflict between the Two Cities runs through the whole of human history, but hitherto a limit has been set to it by the limitation of human power and knowledge. But today the scientific development of the techniques of social control have created a new situation in which for the first time in history it has become possible to make the human soul itself a cog in the mechanism of planned organization. This is the challenge that Christians have to face today, and they can do so only by returning to the foundations—to the organic principles of spiritual life and spiritual freedom which are the laws of the Church's life.

CHRISTOPHER DAWSON.

JAPANESE AND GERMANS

THE Japanese are materialists to a degree which the European mind finds difficult to grasp. Whatever their racial origins (specialists discern Malay, Southern Chinese and Mongolian strains in their composition), they were early blended into a remarkably homogeneous whole. Cut off on their islands on the farthest fringe of Asia, they virtually knew no others but themselves. Their extremely materialistic turn of mind caused them to consider their own chief the highest being known to them, and thus a "manifest divinity". Their legends, embodying perhaps memories of the different countries of their origin, hold that the Japanese race, and indeed the very islands of Japan, were brought forth by a species of parturition peculiar to divinities, while their Emperor (the ruler of all under heaven) is held to be the direct descendant of the Sun Goddess. Thus from the very earliest times the Japanese have worshipped their

Emperor: doubtless a study of *The Golden Bough* would reveal similar instances from many parts of the world. Worship of a god-like emperor, who sums up, as it were, the race, means in point of fact self-worship; with it goes worship of the heroes of the race and of the race itself. It is in fact a primitive "tribalism"; the tribe is the end-all of existence, and loyalty to the tribe is the greatest virtue recognized. The tribe being all that matters to members of it, no infringement of loyalty to it is contemplated: any person thought to have transgressed pays the penalty with his life. It is a grim picture of a primitive state of society where religion (in the lowest meaning of the term) and politics are not divided; where the tribe is all and the individual nothing. The tribe is viewed as an extension of the family; the ruler is the father of his people in a more than metaphorical sense. Justice is thought of from a purely "family" and sentimental viewpoint; individuals have no rights—each has his place in his family, and thus in the greater family of the State. Each has duties arising from his loyalty to his superior, and thus upwards to the Emperor, and thence to his race as a whole. There is no notion of *noblesse oblige*, no thought of responsibilities towards inferiors—only of loyalty upwards to the Emperor and to the race past, present and future. This is "Kodo", the Way of the "Emperor", proclaimed by the contemporary Japanese as the natural way of life for all Asiatics, and indeed for the rest of the world as well. With their cry of "Hakko Ichiu", which means the eight points of the compass under one roof, Japanese fanatics express their intention of forcing this "natural" way of life on all mankind.

Such were roughly the views of the Japanese of the early centuries of the Christian era; such are the views of the militarists now controlling Japanese thought and policy. They form the basis of Shinto—the Way of the Gods—which is the State idolatry of modern Japan. A firm grasp of them and of their implications is perhaps all that may be necessary for an understanding of present Japanese actions: it is woefully inadequate to any attempt at understanding the psychology of the Japanese people. For this a brief survey of Japanese history is necessary. Roughly speaking, the Japanese swallowed Chinese civilization in the seventh century A.D.; they were dazzled by the splendour of T'ang dynasty in China and hastily adapted to their own purposes Chinese ideograms, thought, ceremonial, music, painting and Buddhism, which was at that time at its most flourishing in China. It seemed that they had almost forgotten their ancient tribal views: Buddhist temples sprang up everywhere, even emperors resigned and became Buddhist monks. Nobles gave

themselves over to the writing of Chinese verse, to the smelling of incense and to the arrangement of gorgeous ceremonies. Japanese materialism means that the Japanese concentrate on externals; since they are exclusively of the earth earthy, the world and all its physical aspects are of relatively greater importance to them than to us. They therefore seized upon Chinese painting and applied arts, and in some senses carried them to their logical conclusion. Mr. Arthur Waley's exquisite translation of a novel of the period (tenth century A.D.), *The Tale of Genji*, by the Lady Murasaki Shikibu, takes the reader into a society the vestiges of which can only be discerned by the connoisseur in modern Japan. This period of great refinement was succeeded by an age of military strife, during which the feudal structure of Japan about which so much is written took shape, and during which certain dynamic Buddhist sects developed. It is embarrassing being ruled by a god, because he cannot be criticized; Buddhism was used almost as a mechanism to keep the Emperor out of the way. The ruling of the country was done by the "Barbarian Subduing Generalissimo" or "Shogun"; he had his own "military government", or "Bakufu", and was surrounded by his own military nobility, or "Daimyo", who in turn had their retainers or "Samurai". Roughly from the twelfth to the beginning of the seventeenth century Japan was in a state of turmoil, which, however, did not prevent great artistic productivity. From 1637 until 1854 under the "Shogunate" of the Tokugawa family, Japan was closed to intercourse with the world; this step was perhaps taken because the dangers of contact with the freer air of the outer world, with its universal as opposed to tribal standards, became obvious due to the success of the early Christian missionaries in Japan. During these two hundred years of isolation Japan became virtually a Totalitarian State; every detail of life was regulated down to the patterns of clothes to be worn by different ages and classes. Vitality was regimented out of Buddhism; art became rather stale and mannered. Further towards the end of the eighteenth century scholars began to take an interest in the ancient chronicles of the race, and in its early tribal religion. They noted the difference between the divine Emperor's cloistered and poor existence to that which he was supposed once to have had; a movement to restore him to his former position was on foot, and to oust the Shogun from his usurped place. This movement had gained momentum by the time the American Commodore Perry appeared with his "black ships" off Japan in 1853. All the progressive elements in Japan, who had chafed at the Tokugawa Shogunate's policy of seclusion, rallied with the "neo-Shinto-

ists"; the Tokugawa Shogunate was overthrown, and in 1868 the Emperor was taken from his monastic seclusion and "restored" to nominal power in the place of the Shogun. Everything was done to mark the change; the old capital of Kyoto was abandoned in place of Yedo. Buddhism, which, as already suggested, had become part of the mechanism of keeping emperors in seclusion, suffered an eclipse, and was even for a time proscribed, and Buddhist monuments were often damaged by iconoclasts and vandals. Shinto won the day, and Japan returned to the primitive tribalism, which under Chinese influence she had largely discarded twelve hundred years before.

To the Japanese mind the "restoration" of the Emperor is synonymous with the opening of Japan to intercourse with the rest of the world. All the successes that Japan has achieved since her emergence from seclusion are attributed dutifully to the restoration of the Emperor and to his august and benign influence. The reinstatement of Shintoism is thus a very recent phenomenon, and one which has not escaped the attention of Western observers. During the last decade it has reached its apogee: this was in fact achieved in 1940, when the Japanese Government (with typical guile) declared State Shinto not to be a religion—by which, however, they meant that it was above all religions, a fact which Shinto apologists took pains to explain. This development of—or rather retrogression to—Shinto and to the ideology of the dim past was undertaken consciously, but was given immense and understandable impetus by the exciting period of discovery following upon the opening of the country: all the excitement was attributed to the restoration and the return to the basic ideas of the tribe. Western authors have often marvelled at the rapidity with which Japan developed herself upon Western industrial lines: they have perhaps missed the parallel with our own renaissance. The thrill of learning unsuspected sciences still sustains Japan in her period of rebirth. However, the very excitement of contact with the unknown led the Japanese to cling to that which seems to them most fundamental and most primitive in themselves; the neo-Shintoists of the eighteenth century had pointed the way, and the rulers of restoration Japan—Prince Ito in particular—led their country back to the primitive paths of tribalism, emperor worship and worship of the race, which form the essence of Shinto. But Shinto boasts no lofty code of ethics, no metaphysical structure, and offers nothing capable of satisfying the thirst for knowledge of eager, intelligent Japanese. It has become a repressive force: universal ideas, absolute standards of value are foreign to it, and are therefore almost classed among the "dangerous thoughts"

which the Japanese Government has been at such pains to eradicate or at least to control. From the Japanese point of view the compromise of 1940 was extremely skilful: by declaring that State Shinto is not a religion, and by at the same time recognizing four "religions", which were for their better regimentation placed under the Ministry of Education, the Japanese Government thinks that the sting has been taken out of the real religions. The four religions thus recognized are: Buddhism, Islam, Christianity and "Sectarian Shinto" (amounting in practice to sects dealing with some peculiar aspect of Shinto, or the numerically important modern sects which aim at a synthesis of world religions). Of these, Islam and Christianity were recognized solely for political reasons—in order that they might be used with advantage in relations with foreign countries. State Shinto is then regarded by the present-day Japanese as the serious business of life: any infringement of it is the gravest matter, as witness the discomfiture of Professor Minobe, who declared that the Emperor is an organ of the State—a blasphemous supposition, for which he was relieved of all his honours—and again the very recent casting aside of the veteran politician Ozaki for having once declared that Japan was moving towards the democratic state. While any slip on the part of the most innocent schoolmaster when reading the Imperial Rescript on education would mean his disgrace, if it did not lead him to commit suicide to evade it! The four religions are regarded by the Japanese official mind as admirable palliatives to those whose higher aspirations find no place in the puerilities of the State idolatry; they are regarded almost as hobbies, which keep people quiet and may come in useful. They are only tolerated at all as long as they toe the line.

Thus Japan reached independently and in a subtler and perhaps even more thorough way the position in which we now see Nazi Germany. To both the State is an end in itself: no religion which interferes with the state idolatry or the racial myth is tolerated—or if it is temporarily tolerated at all, it is for a definite and mundane purpose. But there are thousands in Germany, who, while they are buoyed up by the thrills of herd emotion—or by the lazy temptation of thinking themselves not as other men—none the less know in their heart of hearts the extent of German retrogression—the extent of the German betrayal of the West. There are also many intelligent Japanese who find themselves equally embarrassed by the official legends and the official creed, and who realize the limitations of tribalism and are humiliated by this realization. Perhaps they sense that Japan has betrayed Asia? Perhaps they grasp the horrid gulf

between the puerilities of Shinto and the lofty, serene and humane wisdom of China? Perhaps they understand the space that separates their earthbound vision from the sublime metaphysical speculations of the Indian genius? Germany has turned her back on the finest traditions of Europe, and is seeking to drag the rest of Europe back to a murky state which the complacent had imagined to belong to the remote past. Japan is engaged on precisely similar adventures. Let us hope that the rest of Asia realize sooner than did so many countries of Europe the danger that threatens them! As for the average German or Japanese who accepts unquestionably the tribal views on which he is fed, let him know that despair is his lot. There is no room in *Herrenvolk* ideology for defeat, and his defeat is sure.

ARTHUR WILSON.

THE INDEX OF THE BODY

IN the *Prelude* (Book VIII, 11, 279-81) Wordsworth wrote :

the human form
To me became an index of delight,
Of grace and honour, power and worthiness.

The most important word there is *index*. There are moments in all poetry when the reader has to ask himself whether a word used by the poet is accurate not only for the poet's universe but for the reader's own. It is a secondary decision, since the first must be only of the poetic value, but it is sometimes important. That is so here; the word *index*, pressed to its literal meaning, is a word which demands attention, and afterwards assent or dissent.

It is true that Wordsworth himself did not develop the idea; he is speaking generally, and in other passages his genius suggests that the index is to a volume written in a strange language. This is no weakness in Wordsworth; it was, on one side, his particular business. Thus the image of the Leech-Gatherer in *Resolution and Independence* is drawn at least as inhuman as human; so is the Soldier in Book IV of the *Prelude* who is the cause of such terror, and other wanderers; the woman with the pitcher, and even Lucy Gray, are of the same kind. They are on the borders of two worlds, which almost pass and repass into each other.

Wordsworth, of all the Romantics, came nearest to defining and mapping that border-land.

There are, of course, also his more exclusively human figures—Michael, for instance, in the poem of that name. Here the human form suggests to him the grandeur of the moral virtues; it is the suffering and labouring spirit of man which he sees. That may have been what he had chiefly in mind in the passage I have quoted: man as “a solitary object and sublime”, but man also “with the most common; husband, father”, who

suffered with the rest
From vice and folly, wretchedness and fear.

But the passage is capable of another reading, and one which proposes to us a real, if less usual, sequence. It is that reading which I wish now to discuss, and the word *index* is the beginning. The question proposed is whether we shall take that word seriously as a statement of the relation of the human form to “grace and honour, power and worthiness”. The human form meant, to Wordsworth, the shape of the shepherd seen among the hills. There it was high and distant. It was a whole being significant of a greater whole—which is, in some sense, the definition of objects seen romantically. But the lines might be applied to the same shape, seen near at hand and analytically. They might refer to the body itself; it is that which can be considered as an index.

What then would be meant by the word? Nothing but itself. An index is a list of various subjects, with references to those places where, in the text of the volume, they are treated at greater length. But, at least, the words naming the subjects are the same; and a really good index will give some idea of the particular kind of treatment offered on the separate pages. Some such idea Wordsworth's lines suggest, the body and even the members of the body may give of the delight, grace, honour, power, and worthiness of man's structure. The structure of the body is an index to the structure of a greater whole.

I am anxious not to use words which seem too much to separate the physical structure from that whole. The fact of death, and the ensuing separation of “body” and “soul”, lead us to consider them too much as separate identities conjoined. But I hope it is not unorthodox to say that body and soul are one identity, and that all our inevitable but unfortunate verbal distinctions are therefore something less than true. Death has been regarded by the Christian Church as an outrage—a necessary outrage, perhaps, but still an outrage. It has been held to be an improper and grotesque schism in a single identity—to which submission,

but not consent, is to be offered ; a thing, like sin, that ought not to be and yet is.

It is one of the intellectual results of the Fall that our language has always to speak in terms of the Fall ; and that we cannot help our language does not make it any more true. The epigrams of saints, doctors, and poets are the nearest we can go to the recovery of that ancient validity, our unfallen speech. To treat the body as an index is to assume that, as in an index, the verbal element—the *word* given—is the same as in the whole text, so in the physical structure of that greater index the element—the *quality* given—is the same as in the whole structure. Another poet, Patmore, put the thing in a similar light when he wrote that

from the graced decorum of the hair,
Ev'n to the tingling sweet
Soles of the simple earth-confiding feet
And from the inmost heart
Outwards unto the thin
Silk curtains of the skin,
Every least part
Astonish'd hears
And sweet replies to some like region of the spheres.

"The spheres" there are likely to mean, first, the outer skies ; this idea is practically that of the microcosm and the macrocosm : the idea that a man is a small replica of the universe. Man was "the workshop of all things", "a little world", "*mundus minor exemplum majoris mundi ordine*", "*filius totius mundi*". It is a very ancient idea ; it was held before Christianity and has been held during Christianity ; it was common to Christians, Jews, and Mohammedans ; and, for all I know, the scientific hypothesis of evolution bears a relation to the union of the two. Into that however I am not learned enough to go. The idea went through many changes, but its general principle remained constant : that man was the rational epitome of the universe. It led, of course, to many absurdities, and (if you choose—like any other idea) to some evils. Some writers catalogued painstakingly the more obvious fantasies : hair was the grass or the forests ; bones were mountains ; the sun was the eyes, and so on. Astrology, if not based on it, at least found the idea convenient ; however we may reject that ancient study, it had at least this philosophic principle mixed up with it—that each man, being unique, was a unique image of the universe, that the spatially greater affected the spatially lesser, and the calculable influences of the stars were only calculable because each man represented and reproduced the whole. Astrology then was a high and learned science ; it was forbidden for good reasons, but it was not fatalistic. It did

not say "this will certainly happen"; it said: "Given these stellar and individual relations, this result is likely." But the will of God and the wills of men were allowed much freedom to interfere with the result. *Sapiens dominabitur astris*. The paragraphs in our papers today bear as much resemblance to the science as texts lifted up on boards outside churches do to the whole dogmas of the Church. The paragraphs are, I allow, more likely to harm; the texts, on the whole, are innocuous.

Beside, or rather along with, this study went the patterns of other occult schools. The word "occult" has come into general use, and is convenient, if no moral sense is given it simply as itself. It deals with hidden things, and their investigation. But in this case we are concerned not so much with the pretended operations of those occult schools as with a certain imagination of relation in the universe, and that only to pass beyond it. The signs of the Zodiac were, according to some students, related to the parts of the physical body. The particular attributions varied, and all were in many respects arbitrary. But some of them were extremely suggestive; they may be allowed at least a kind of authentic poetic vision. Thus, in one pattern, the house of the Water-carrier was referred to the eyes; the house of the Twins to the arms and hands.

It will be clear that these two attributions at least had a great significance. It will be clear also that in such a poetic (so to call it) imagination we are dealing with a kind of macrocosmic-microcosmic union of a more serious and more profitable kind than the mere exposition by a debased astrology of chances in a man's personal life. It may be invention, but if so it is great invention; the houses of the Zodiac, with their special influences ruling in special divisions of the spatial universe, may be but the fables of astronomy; it must be admitted that few certain facts support them. But they are not unworthy fables. They direct attention to the principles at work both in the spatial heavens and in the structure of man's body. Aquarius is for water, clarity, vision; Gemini are for a plural motion, activity, and achievement; Libra is for that true strength of balance on which the structure of man depends.

With this suggestion, we are on the point of deserting the spatial heavens for something else. The like regions of the spheres, of which Patmore spoke, here begin to be transferred to the spiritual heavens. "As above, so below" ran the old maxim, but even that dichotomy is doubtful. The houses of the Zodiac, in this, do but confuse the issue, except in so far as they, like the whole universe, exhibit the mystery by which spirit becomes flesh, without losing spirit. Perhaps the best verbal

example is in the common use of the word "heart". Even in our common speech the word is ambiguous. To call Hitler heartless means that he seems to be without the common principle of compassion. It is said that Tertullian (but I have not found the reference) said that "the supreme principle of intelligence and vitality", "the sovereign faculty" of man, resided "where the Egyptians taught—*Namque homini sanguis circumcordialis est sensus*, the sense of man is in the blood around the heart". At least the pulsating organ presents, for man, his proper physical rhythm in the whole—*mundus minor exemplum majoris mundi ordine*. As our meaning—physical life or compassionate life—so the word *heart*. Compassion is the union of man with his fellows, as in the blood. The physical heart is, in this sense, an "index" to both. Gerard Hopkins wrote, of the Blessed Virgin :

If I have understood
 She holds high motherhood
 Towards all our ghostly good
 And plays in grace her part
 About man's beating heart.
 Laying like air's fine flood,
 The deathdance in his blood :
 Yet no part but what will
 Be Christ our Saviour still.

The visionary forms of the occult schools are but dreams of the Divine Body.

All these brief allusions show that there has been some tradition of significance—poetic, occult, religious. Christians, however, may be permitted to press the significance more closely ; they may be allowed to ask whether the body is not indeed a living epigram of virtue. There have been doctors who held that Christ would not have become incarnate if man had not sinned ; there have been doctors who held that He would. Either way, it is clear that that Sacred Body was itself virtue. The same qualities that made His adorable soul made His adorable flesh. If the devotion to the Sacred Heart does not, in itself, imply something of this sort, I do not know what it does imply. The virtues are both spiritual and physical—or rather they are principles expressed in those two categories. This is recognized in what are regarded as the more "noble" members in the body—the heart, the eyes. But it is not so often recognized as a truth underlying all the members—the stomach, the buttocks. That is partly because we have too long equated the body as such with the "flesh" of St. Paul. But "flesh" is no more than that (as Mgr. Knox pointed out recently in the *Tablet*) it is "sex". The body was holily created, is holily redeemed, and is to be holily

raised from the dead. It is, in fact, for all our difficulties with it, less fallen, merely in itself, than the soul in which the quality of the will is held to reside; for it was a sin of the will which degraded us. "The evidence of things not seen" is in the body seen as this epigram; nay, in some sense, even "the substance of things hoped for", for what part it has in that substance remains to it unspoiled.

It is in this sense then that the body is indeed an "index" to delight, power, and the rest. "Who conceives", wrote Prior,

Who conceives, what bards devise,
That heaven is placed in Celia's eyes?

Well, no; not so simply as that. But Celia's eyes are a part of the body which (said Patmore, who was orthodox enough)

Astonish'd hears
And sweet replies to some like region of the spheres.

And those spheres are not merely the old spatial macrocosmic heavens, but the deep heaven of our inner being. The discernment of pure goodwill, of (let it be said for a moment) pure love in Celia's eyes, at some high moment of radiant interchange or indeed at any other moment, is no less part of the heavenly vision (so tiny and remote as it may be) because it is a physical as well as a spiritual vision. The word "sacramental" has perhaps here served us a little less than well; it has, in popular usage, suggested rather the spiritual *using* the physical rather than a common—say, a single—operation.

Eyes then are compacted power; they are an index of vision; they see and refer us to greater seeing. Nor has the stomach a less noble office. It digests food; that is, in its own particular method, it deals with the nourishment offered by the universe. It is a physical formula of that health which destroys certain elements—the bacteria which harmfully approach us. By it we learn to consume; by it therefore to be, in turn, consumed.

It will be thought I labour the obvious; and I will not go through the physical structure suggesting and propounding identities. The point will have been sufficiently made if the sense of that structure being heavenly not by a mere likeness but in its own proper nature is achieved. It is a point not so much of doctrine as of imagination. That imagination is at once individual and social. The temples of the Holy Ghost are constructed all on one plan: and our duties to our material fellows are duties to structures of beatitude. The relation of the Incarnation to our own mode of generation is blessedly veiled. But its relation to those other identities of power is not at all doubtful. It is

not only physical structures we neglect or damage by our social evils ; it is living indexes of life. The Virtues exist in all of them materially, but it is the Virtues which so exist. Christ, in some sense, derived His flesh from them, for He derived it from His Mother, and she from her ancestors, and they from all mankind.

The Sacred Body is the plan upon which physical human creation was built, for it is the centre of physical human creation. The great dreams of the human form as including the whole universe are in this less than the truth. As His, so ours ; the body, in this sense of an index, is also a pattern. We carry about with us an operative synthesis of the Virtues ; and it may be held that when we fall in love (for example), we fall in love precisely with the operative synthesis.

Grace was in all her steps, heaven in her eye ;
In every gesture dignity and love ;

is much more a definite statement of fact than we had supposed ; footsteps are astonishing movements of grace. That we cannot properly control and direct our sensations and emotions is not surprising ; but the greatness of man is written even in his incapacity, and when he sins he sins because of a vision which, even though clouded, is great and ultimate. As every heresy is a truth pushed disproportionately, so with every sin ; at least, with every physical sin. But, however in those states of "falling in love" the vision of a patterned universe is revealed to us, the revelation vanishes, and we are left to study it slowly, heavily, and painfully. All that the present essay attempts to do is to present a point of view which has behind it, one way and another, a great tradition—a tradition which, for Christians, directs particular attention to the Sacred Body as the Archetype of all bodies. In this sense the Eucharist exposes also its value ; indeed, there our bodies digest. The stomach, itself an "index", an incarnate quality of the moral universe, receives the Archetype of all moralities truly incarnated ; and not only the pattern in the soul and will but the pattern in the body is renewed. Or, better, in that unity which we, under the influence of our Greek culture, divide into soul and body.

Socrates [Dr. William Ellis writes] invented the concept which permeates every part of modern thinking, the concept of the twofold nature of man, of man as a union of the active, or spiritual, with the inactive or corporeal ; the concept, in short, of the organism as a dead carcass actuated by a living ghost. Even if we repudiate this idea, we are still half-dominated by it, so deeply does it underlie our pattern of culture.*

Ia m far from suggesting that this is the proper Christian view.

* *The Idea of the Soul in Western Philosophy and Science.* Allen & Unwin. 1940.

But there is, I think, no doubt that it is not far from the popular Christian view. The fuss that has been made about Browning's line (not that that was Browning's fault)—"nor soul helps flesh more now than flesh helps soul"—shows that. It was repeated almost as a new revelation, though indeed the Lady Julian had said almost the same thing centuries before. We have to overcome that lazy habit of the imagination—the outrage of death notwithstanding. We experience, physically, in its proper mode, the Kingdom of God: the imperial structure of the body carries its own high doctrines—of vision, of digestion of mysteries, of balance, of movement, of operation. "That soul", said Dante in the *Convivio*, "which embraces all these powers (the rational, the sensitive, and the vegetative) is the most perfect of all the rest." The rational, or self-conscious, power is indeed the noblest, but we must ask from it a complete self-consciousness, and not a self-consciousness in schism.

It was suggested that the stress of this imagination may be an incentive to our social revolution. For if the body of our neighbour is compact of these heavenly qualities, incarnated influences, then we are indeed neglecting the actual Kingdom of God in neglecting it. It is the living type of the Archetypal. We have not merely to obey a remote moral law in feeding and succouring and sheltering it. It is the "index" of power; tear away the index, and we are left without the power; tear away the "index" and we are left without the delight. Let the whole to which that "index" witnesses be as immense as any volume of truth may be, and still the value of that small substance remains. Every student of a learned work uses the index attentively. A good index can indeed be studied in itself. To study the body so is to increase our preparation for the whole great text.

CHARLES WILLIAMS.

BUSINESS PRACTICE AND THE COMMON GOOD

WE are witnessing the attempt to transform an industry which is supposed to be governed wholly by considerations of monetary reward to the purposes of total war. On its purely human side the task would, one would have thought, not have proved overwhelmingly difficult. Despite high taxation the war provides conditions which should enable the economic in-

centive to produce the best possible results. If profits are limited they are at any rate certain, and nearly all contracts admit of good remuneration for the worker. Circumstances therefore obtain which ought to have brought about the very maximum liberation of human energy.

This does not appear to be the case. Nobody who has worked in industry, especially if, like the present writer, he has worked in industry as a manual worker for a considerable period of time, can fail to be struck by a number of powerful inhibiting factors that are undoubtedly retarding output. The very interesting and voluminous report on War Production which has been issued through the Advertising Service Guild voices this feeling again and again.

While it is certain that a great many industrial war workers are working really hard, and especially that they are working exhausting *hours*, it is also certain that all through war industry a high premium is still put on your personal prejudice and point of view, and that whatever the behaviour of individuals, the behaviour of groups and group leaders is not fully co-operative. . . . Over and over again in this investigation we came across obstructions, suspicions, prejudices directly impeding action the necessity for which was fully agreed.

The following passage not only describes the malady in greater detail, but brings us nearer to its heart.

The crude incentive (of money) is as traditional in industry as the principle of non-responsibility for what happens outside the factory and the power of the instantaneous sack. The replacing of this incentive, much watered down since the war, by some other incentive is a major consideration in the coming months, and one which has as yet hardly been faced. The only practical alternative incentive appears to be patriotism and enthusiasm; the many current demands for a new spirit in the country reflect this. But it is very difficult to see how such a spirit can be obtained so long as the average worker is working for the average employer and the average management is concerned with the interests of the average shareholder. This is not a question just of economics, if indeed it is a question of economics at all. It is a question of psychology and symbolism.

This is much more in the present writer's view than a mere wartime problem. The division of the industrial world into two warring armies has been noted by an authority more considerable than the authors of the present report, but it has been noted as essentially a conflict of interest rather than as a conflict of two sets of irreconcilable values and ideas. Yet that at the moment is its essential character. Habits of mind and *idées fixes* have taken root. Certain attitudes have become traditional and these things are now quite as important in determining the volume of energy released as self-interest, supposedly enlightened, acting in the pursuit of economic gain.

There is a wide difference between the antagonism existing within a social framework which both sides implicitly accept and the kind of antagonism that arises when one of the sides rejects the very principles of that framework. It is the latter thing that is happening now. It is not that the worker resents the supposed greed, selfishness and other disagreeable but essentially human characteristics of managements. He resents today the whole operative principle by which managements are supposed to be governed. He is in fact rapidly rejecting the whole idea of private enterprise, and unless something is done the day will soon come when private enterprise will simply no longer be able to function. Indeed, the strong emotional associations that have grown around all the essential features and motives of modern business organization in the ranks of the workers may soon constitute a serious obstacle to its further continuance. Private enterprise may have to be abandoned, not because of its inherent lack of excellence but because of the disastrous character of the conditioned reflexes that have become associated with it. The report states clearly and, in the writer's opinion accurately, that among persons who hold any strong views on the subject the great majority disapprove of the whole notion of profit-making enterprise.

A related phenomenon that is very curious is the apparent inability of business to put up a case for itself. The whole of economic literature during the past generation has hardly produced a single work which seeks to view the present economic order as a system and justify it as a system. Such few attempts as have been made are intellectually inconsiderable. The defence put up by the financial press for the essential phenomenon of profits, when it has occasion to protest against their curtailment, is a curiously lame one and the advocacy is actually much worse than the cause. The unhappy word "incentive" is ridden to death, though that word suggests that the chief function of profits is merely the satisfaction of a crude acquisitive instinct, whereas in reality the motive for commercial profit-making is far more complex and, it may be said, far more creditable.

Now, it must be recognized that at the back of all the working-class ferment there is a real outraging of the moral sense that goes far deeper than the old quarrel between rich and poor (indeed those affected by it are often far removed from the threat of destitution), and the forensic inadequacy of Big Business really does derive from a certain radical weakness in its case. *I would define that weakness as the absence, from the spirit of the law governing commerce, of any explicit recognition of the principle of the common good.*

The most obvious example of this is the legal position of the

company director, who is recognized as a trustee but only as the trustee of his own shareholders. All commercial law is still based on the assumptions governing the era of unlimited economic expansion, when it could be assumed with a certain amount of justification that, given reasonably good management and reasonably good luck, any venture would increase the aggregate wealth of the community. Natural resources seemed inexhaustible and possible social repercussions of large-scale commercial activity appeared negligible in comparison with the benefits bestowed. In these circumstances the duty of the civil authority seemed to reach no farther than to protect the investor against ordinary speculation and fraud, and the would-be investor against the seductions of the discoverers of non-auriferous goldmines and of oil wells that yielded no oil.

But times are changing. We are learning bitterly that the bounties of nature are limited and can suffer from abuse, that we can all suffer damage from the immediately lucrative but socially imprudent use of scarce means, and finally that the aggregations of vast masses of capital have a power to bring about the most far-reaching changes in the whole structure of social life. We are, moreover, beginning to realize that profits earned by producers and vendors are no indication that the consumer is getting either what he wants or what is good for him, or that what he wants and what is good for him is being provided in the greatest possible abundance or for the lowest possible price.

The divergence between the common and the individual good, which circumstances of an earlier generation had tended to obscure, and which the Classical Economists sought precariously to bridge, is becoming too glaring for a system based on an implicit denial of that divergence to operate successfully.

Fortunately for us, the existence of the present impasse is already realized by a large number of the more enlightened elements in the business world. This is not surprising, for the motives influencing business men have often been a great deal better than those by which in theory they were supposed to be influenced. A debate has recently been going on in various places concerning the alleged need of substituting the service incentive for the profit incentive. But in truth these incentives are already very subtly blended. The business man, and especially the producer, is urged forward by a variety of considerations in which the desire for money is mixed up with thoughts of prestige, pride in performance, and above all with the desire to be able to continue rendering the service that he is rendering at the moment, and so to continue to pull his weight in the

community. The anxiety about profits has always been very largely an anxiety to secure this last.

The present writer was for one period closely associated with the export trade, and in the course of business he had to come in contact with a number of managing directors and other big executives in the patent medicine business. Now, for some reason the patent medicine business has always been regarded the special field of the cynically acquisitive. It tends to be looked upon as a particularly telling example of anarchic individualism in economic affairs.

In actual fact the trade has tended to be rather maligned. Few of the claims of patent medicine manufacturers are completely fraudulent nowadays and most patent medicines do at least some good to some of the people for some of the time. Even so, the margin between manufacturing cost and selling price is generally an outrageously large one, and the trade is certainly an instance of a market being created by a quite unjustifiable volume of advertising expenditure. In all these circumstances one would expect the outlook of those engaged in it to be free from any suspicion of altruism and quite unaffected by any other consideration than those of crude monetary gain. But this was far from being the case. The circumstances of my business were such that the gentlemen in question could have had no object in being other than perfectly frank with me and laying all their cards on the table. Yet what dominated their conversation to the point of sometimes becoming positively monotonous was an almost passionate enthusiasm for the excellence of the article they were marketing, an enthusiasm which often seemed to approximate to something like missionary zeal. These men may, or may not, have been benefactors of the human race, but there can be no possible doubt that they thought they were, and I gained the impression that they would have been quite unable to carry on their business unless sustained by that belief. I find that others who have been concerned in this particular market have had similar impressions to my own.

Probably such an attitude in business is confined to those who are directly and intimately associated with some process of production, or the rendering of some service, and is much rarer among men who merely hold a watching brief for some financial interest. But since the war the influence of the latter has tended somewhat to weaken, while that of the professional manager has increased. Shareholders have been growing more docile and apathetic over the past few years, and what with Income Tax, Excess Profits Tax and the rest they have less cause than

ever
par
me
gro
mo
ten
inc
exi
sati
ser
of
7
ben
mu
of
mu
gen
A
for
ma
Sta
cip
cha
gra
C
fro
par
the
the
Ne
we
dec
the
ant
of
bey
int
the
rel
as
bus
ter
sel
*
37

ever today for showing much interest in the affairs of their companies. If their criterion of management has been the management's ability to make money for them they have certainly little ground for exciting themselves, for they will get precious little money anyway. Thus the professional manager, who has often tended to be a great deal more interested in his job than in the income of his shareholders, is having a much more untrammelled existence than before. These men find the new conditions very satisfying and will often tell you that they like the idea of being servants of the community a great deal better than being servants of anybody else.

The position, then, at the moment, is that there are large numbers of men in leading and influential posts whose outlook is much more in harmony with the Christian social ideal than that of company law. Yet while the law remains unchanged it must necessarily remain the most important expression of the general outlook and philosophy of the society in which we live.

A change in the law would necessarily go beyond a mere formulation of principle. Indeed, the general practice in such matters is usually for various ad hoc enactments to come on the Statute Book and for the Bench to deduce the underlying principles at a later date. It is in this manner, most probably, that a change in the status and functions of company directors would gradually come about.

Certain specific proposals which have come forward recently from highly responsible quarters are in the light of this reflection particularly worthy of study. Among the most important of these was a series of four articles which recently appeared in the *Accountant* and was subsequently reprinted in the *Financial News* under the title "The Future of Auditing".* The articles were the work of a number of professional accountants "who had decided to form themselves into a group for the study of some of the problems of the post-war world in so far as they, as accountants, could contribute to their solution". The general argument of these articles was that the auditor's function should go far beyond that of mere financial check, that it should safeguard the interest which society had in good management (of which, as the authors rightly observe, the mere ability to earn profits is no reliable criterion), and should even pass judgement on the ethical as opposed to the merely legal probity of the conduct of the business. In this latter connection the authors make the interesting suggestion to which I shall return a little later, that a select body of persons thoroughly versed in the ramifications of

* The four articles are now obtainable in pamphlet form from the City Library, 37 Basinghall Street, E.C.2, post free, 1s. 1d.

business should analyse our industrial abuses. "For example, the Eighth Commandment might be translated into terms of modern opportunities for industrial and commercial stealing." Such a review is certainly desirable. It is to be regretted that many publicists who endeavour to analyse business from the point of view of the moralist have generally a clear grasp of morals but a comparatively fragmentary comprehension of business. They are generally obsessed with the idea that profits are made by depressing wages, and that the lowering of working-class standards is the chief preoccupation of the owner of capital goods. They have little to say on many more pressing questions. They are silent on such matters as the turning of the debenture into an instrument for the legalized robbery of creditors, or the deliberate overtrading practised by large department stores who abuse their bargaining position to make ruinous exactions of credit from small suppliers.

It must be admitted that the authors of the articles in question left the problem of the selection and training of the candidates for these highly difficult and responsible duties which they envisage a little bit up in the air, but the point of interest here lies less in the actual suggestions made than in the clear admission of the principle that the common good should be safeguarded, and that there is a need for the creation of specialized machinery to perform this task.

Rather similar considerations apply to an article published by Mr. Samuel Courtauld published in the *Economic Journal*. Mr. Courtauld is also conscious that the business man has a duty not merely towards himself and that both as a matter of right and expediency the community may claim the exercise of some control over his actions. Mr. Courtauld's suggestion that Government directors, whatever these may be, should sit on the board of all companies over a certain size does not get us very far, since he does not explain who is to direct these directors and on what principles they are to be directed and trained.

A higher critical level was attained by a recent leading article in the *Economist* entitled "Directors and Auditors" which pressed for a far fuller statement of affairs in published company accounts. The following passage is eloquent of the general line taken :

There is nothing new in the plea for reform in this matter. It has been pressed, with a very modest degree of success, ever since the habit of investment spread from the wealthy few to a considerable portion of the population. What is, perhaps, new is that, while in the past it was urged primarily as a duty to the shareholder, now it is apparent that the duty is no less due to the other partners in industry, both labour and the actual management, and indeed to the whole community.

If this point of view is accepted certain specific reforms seem to follow pretty automatically. Broadly speaking, the shareholder is only interested in the volume of profits and not in the means whereby they are made. This does not necessarily imply that he wishes to make profits by means of sweated labour (in any case a relatively rare form of offending), but that he is indifferent to the wasteful use of the community's resources by which profits can often be stepped up. That, however, is exactly what the outside community ought to know about, and it seems to the present writer that the first proof of a new orientation would be the compulsory publication of a trading account in which the volume of expenditure on materials, wages, salaries, advertising and similar items would be clearly set forth for anybody to read. This would, of course, reveal information to competitors which directors are usually mildly concerned to conceal. But in practice competitors who are really curious can generally find out much of what they want to know, and concealment is usually desired from motives that do not exactly serve the public interest.

The present writer will also go so far as to suggest that the personal emoluments of every executive officer in any company should be ascertainable, and can think of no reason for objecting to this that is not discreditable. The business man and the business executive must either regard themselves as servants of the public, or their position becomes morally indefensible, and if they are servants of the public, the public has a perfect right to know what it is paying them.

Legislation in forcing publicity of this kind would be the first of the *ad hoc* measures that would cause the legal principle of responsibility towards the public to become established.

We have, however, still to consider the more difficult question of how some machinery of check could be organized to ensure that businesses were, in fact, giving full service to the community. Should our proposed "Government directors" and/or our new auditors be ordinary full ranking civil servants? Commenting on Mr. Courtauld's proposals that Government directors holding a watching brief on the boards of industry, the *Economist* speaks of the need "to train and institute a new kind of civil servant capable in matters of industry and economics". But whether our new watchdog is to be a reformed kind of director or a reformed kind of auditor, there are weighty reasons against making him into a Government servant of any kind. The State today is a secular thing and is therefore ill-equipped to deal with matters intimately affecting moral and human values, and in the last resort it is on questions of the latter kind that decisions

will have to be taken. It does not, as far as the writer has ever been able to discover, appear to have occurred to any of those who have touched on these matters recently that there is a half-way house between control by the State and the appointment to offices of the kind under review of ordinary private professional men. The half-way house is the chartered corporation, of which the most outstanding example is the B.B.C.

The chartered corporation has the advantage that it can develop a positive character and personality, and therefore a strong and positive policy which would hardly be possible in a Government department. It can formulate values. However, it does enjoy one of a Government Department's advantages; it can be assured by various means, such as a general levy on the community as a whole or any part of it, of revenues which will enable it to make the fullest possible use of all technical resources and put them equally at the disposal of rich and poor. A chartered corporation would therefore be better suited than any other instrument to hold the kind of watching brief for society of which we are obviously in need, and would be well adapted to carry out a kind of "social audit" of business firms. It could develop the experience and command the scientific resources to give an accurate assessment of the quality of products; it could have its specialized departments for assessing and advising on organizational efficiency and efficiency of process, and it is not too much to hope that it might ultimately link up with the various trade associations and claim a right to benefit by their specialized experience. One thing is certainly necessary in this connection—an abandonment of the policy of secrecy of process and of the usurious and monopolistic exploitation of patents and inventions. This brings us a little outside the scope of the present enquiry, and it will be sufficient to say that human ingenuity can devise means whereby the inventors of new processes can reap generous rewards without allowing such inventions to become the means of strangling competitors. It might also be observed that the principle of secrecy of process is at the moment being widely abandoned under the pressure of war, and that manufacturers are disclosing to each other through their newly formed "Mutual Aid Groups" many matters which had previously been treated as confidential.

Yet perhaps the most important function which such a corporation could perform would be to develop a clear set of principles, a task in which the Church and leaders of religion should definitely be called upon to play a part. The need for reformulating certain ethical criteria for business has already been noted. The task of ascertaining whether a business, while

keeping within the letter of the law, was also maintaining the standards of common honesty and common decency that ordinary self-respecting people practise in their dealings with one another should in the main not be one of great difficulty. The authors of "The Future of Auditing" are quite right in saying that these tasks are well within the competence of the average layman. There are, however, more abstruse and difficult questions concerning the nature of human values and human satisfactions which call for the help of the specialist.

In a "social audit"* of this kind, if such a term may be used, very great weight will rightly be attached to questions of efficiency, and this is entirely in keeping with Christian social doctrine as formulated in the Encyclicals. At the same time efficiency may be too dearly bought if it destroys the mental health of the worker, or the independence of a business that is still capable of rendering the community reasonable service. Considerations of this kind make obvious the need for the formulation of certain guiding principles and for the clarification of the hierarchy of economic ends.

This will be particularly true when it comes to dealing with banks, insurance companies and similar financial institutions where the social critic will necessarily find himself concerned in questions of broad national policy. The hidden conflict between those who (for reasons which are neither base nor intellectually contemptible) wish to increase the aggregate of national wealth with those whose chief concern is its better distribution, will have finally to be forced into the open and a long overdue clarity of direction and definition achieved.

Finally, once business life has really become defensible it should seriously set about defending itself, and an effort should be made to bring about more enlightened and exact thinking in matters of economics. If we are to retain a system based on profit-making, then we must make up our minds to explain what profit-making really is and what it does, so that it is no longer looked upon as just another rather odious aberration of our fallen human nature—which seems to be its valuation in the prevailing popular estimate.

The writer believes that the suggestions that he has made in this article are in no way visionary. On the contrary, they echo and amplify suggestions coming from men who are in the very heart of business and have wide business experience. They are in harmony with a widely prevailing trend of thought and feeling. Importance should, however, be attached, not so much

* I am assuming that a social auditor's certificate will ultimately be added to that of the ordinary auditor.

to the suggestions themselves, as to the acceptance of the principle which underlies them. They are nothing but practical expressions of the duty of business to serve the common good.

It is the lack of such an explicit norm that is at the root of so much of our social discontent and disunity. Its formal and explicit establishment would probably be the means of a new and vital social integration.

J. L. BENVENISTI.

RELIGIOUS POETRY IN MODERN SPAIN

AS in politics, so also in literature, Spain during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, especially from 1835 to 1935, has manifested two main trends of thought: traditionalism and cosmopolitanism of the lower type. We call it "of the lower type" advisedly, for by it we mean the servile imitation, and importation into the Spanish world of letters, of an exotic ideology and even of literary forms quite foreign to the Spanish classical school. Precocious youths left Spain in their teens and twenties and in foreign capitals, especially in Paris, learned to worship everything foreign and to despise Spain. It was they, even more than non-Spanish writers, who spread the *leyenda negra* (the Black Legend) by belittling and blackening their native land. The Spanish poet Bartrina (1850-1880), by no means a traditionalist, described them in fitting lines, of which the following is an English adaptation:

A youth I left my home of sun and song
And oft I've joined the nations' wandering throng.
When I heard people sounding Albion's praise,
"They hail," I said, "from England's noble race";
And if they chanced to carp at Germany,
"Well, they are French," I thought immediately;
But when they started vilifying Spain
I said: "Ah! They are Spaniards. That's quite plain!"

Unfortunately, this type of Spaniard, mixing with the bohemian society of the big cities of Europe and considered as

representative, did much to falsify the view of Spain formed by foreigners.*

The traditionalists represent the opposite school of thought, and perhaps some of them went to the other extreme by refusing to admit into Spanish literature anything with the least flavour of foreign influence about it. These extremists, however, were very few. The main body of Spanish traditionalists—and all the writers of religious poems, of whom we are about to speak, belong to it—were, and are, chiefly concerned with the cultivation of the Spanish field of letters as inherited by them from their Spanish forefathers. Spanish classical tradition in this case has proved the most powerful means of safeguarding and fostering religious poetry. The greatest poets of the golden age of Spanish literature were priests, monks and nuns: St. John of the Cross and St. Theresa (Carmelites), Fray Luis de León (Augustinian), Calderón, Góngora, Lope de Vega (Priests), Tirso de Molina (Mercedarian), etc. All of them wrote exquisite religious versé. They have had followers and imitators in every period of Spanish poetry.

We propose here to review the work of their modern disciples, who are perhaps less known outside Spain than their cosmopolitan contemporaries. By religious poetry we mean that which is sacred in character or which has been obviously inspired by the love and the practice of the Catholic religion. We deal only with those authors who have died, or written, since 1900. With one or two exceptions, which will be duly noted, we exclude the Hispano-American writers.

*No reader of traditional Spanish literature but must lament many of the modern, either blasphemous or inane, outpourings of certain recent Spanish verse-writers. One reads, for instance, in *Prólogo* of Federico Garcia Lorca (born in 1899):

*Además Satans me quiere mucho,
fui compañero mio
en un examen de
lujuria . . .*

Or take this specimen of the so-called *verse* of León Felipe, which is pure prose, and very prosaic prose at that. (The lines are left as in the original):

*No
sabiendo
los oficios
los haremos
con
respeto.*

And yet both compositions are included in *Las Mil Mejores Poesias de la Lengua Castellana* (The One Thousand Best Poems of the Castilian Tongue), edited by José Bergua, 2nd ed., Madrid, 1936, pp. 650 and 581 respectively.

At the opening of the century the writers of religious poetry most in vogue in Spain were Gabriel y Galán (1870-1905), the Jesuit Fathers Julio Alarcón (1843-1922) and Alberto Risco (born in Cuba in 1873), the Piarist Father Calasanz Rabaza (1863-1930), and Jacinto Verdaguer (1845-1902), a priest who wrote in Catalanian. Religious verse was also published by several other poets of distinction, whose main production, however, was rather of a secular character. Of them all, the two most representative of Spanish tradition, and certainly those who appealed most to the Spanish people, were Gabriel y Galán and Verdaguer.

In the year 1904, a few months before his death, Gabriel y Galán sent, at her request, to Pardo Bazón, a poetess and art critic, the following autobiography :

I was born of a family of farmers at Frades de la Sierra, a small hamlet in the province of Salamanca. In this city and in Madrid I studied for the teaching profession. At the age of seventeen I sat for the competitive examination for the post of teacher at the elementary school of Grijuelo (prov. of Salamanca). I got it and lived there four years. Next, I won the public competition for the school of Piedrahita (province of Avila), where I taught another four years. Then I married a girl from Estremadura and resigned my post, since all my leanings were for the life of a farmer. On my farm I now live, wholly occupied with the tilling of my lands and with the love of my neighbour, of my wife and of my three children. I am 34 and devote to composing *coplas* (popular songs) the few hours of leisure which I can manage to steal from work on the land. I began to write verse for the *Juegos Florales* (Poetical Contests) and was awarded first prize (the *Flor Natural*) at those of Salamanca, Saragossa, and Béjar—then sundry others at Saragossa, Murcia, and Lugo. I have nothing more to tell you, if indeed this is anything at all. My countrymen of Salamanca, as also those of Estremadura, are very fond of me; they spoil me. I reciprocate their affection with all my heart, and this inspires me to make songs for them. Indeed, they know my songs by heart, better than I do, and recite them everywhere, and even I hear the farmers singing them every day in the fields.

To this day throughout Spain, Gabriel y Galán's poems are to be heard at concerts, prize-day celebrations and similar gatherings. The poet wrote both in the delightful dialect of Estremadura and in literary Castilian. His favourite themes are work in the fields (*El Himno al Trabajo*, *El Poema del Gañán*), the joys and sorrows of a Christian family life (*El Ama*, *El Embargo*, *El Cristu Benditu*), but chiefly the Catholic heritage of Spain (*Cara al Cielo*, *Castellana*, *Los Pastores de mi Abuelo*, *El Cristo de Velázquez*). He excels at describing "the deep, solemn, austere solitude" of Old Castile.

Jacinto Verdaguer was born in 1845 near Vich, in the very heart of Spanish Catalonia, where the Catalan tradition is—or

was in his time—to be found at its best and purest. Not indeed the artificial Catalanism of Barcelona, whipped up to separatist passion by political ambition, but an intense love of Catalonia and all that it stands for, coupled with a genuine love of Spain. Verdaguer wrote in Catalan, and so far his poetry has not been equalled, much less surpassed, by any of the later Catalanian writers. A priest-poet, Verdaguer, even in his epics *L'Atlantida* and *El Canigó*, betrays his training in the seminary. Many, however, prefer to these the more graceful *Idylls and Mystical Songs* (*Idilis i Cants Místics*) and similar shorter poems of a definitely religious character, which Menéndez Pelayo, the most competent of modern Spanish literary critics, compares to the songs of St. John of the Cross. Verdaguer's verse is always crystal-clear, terse, diaphanous; his vocabulary is neither large nor choice, but his unadorned ideas shine forth like veritable gems. Take, for example, the following couplet:

*Perque miro les estrelles
no estigau, mon Déu, gelós;
m'agrada perdre entre elles
per encontrarvos a Vos.*

Because I gaze at the stars,
Lord, be not jealous of me;
I love to be lost among them
The better to find Thee.

The influence that Verdaguer has exercised in Catalonia is incalculable. It continues yet, and is very powerful. Verdaguer died in 1902.

The second and third decades of the century saw the rise of a group of younger poets who sought inspiration in religion. The most eminent of these are: Ricardo León, José Maria Sanz y Aldaz, Restituto del Valle, an Augustinian, and Dom Justo Pérez de Urbel, O.S.B.

Ricardo León, born in 1877, a clerk in a Madrid bank, is better known as a novelist, but has also written excellent verse in a style unmistakably his own, robust and sonorous. He has published two volumes of verse: *Alivio de Caminantes* (The Solace of Wayfarers)* and *Lira de Bronce* (Bronze Lyre)†. Each contains several pieces of sacred verse. His adaptations of some of the Psalms into Spanish are little masterpieces.

The poetic output of Sanz y Aldaz, a Franciscan tertiary, is very small but very choice—indeed, it comprises but a short poem of twenty-one stanzas on the Eucharist, each stanza being followed by a commentary in prose in the style of St. John of the Cross. As a sample we may quote the *refrain*:

* Madrid, 1911.
Vol. 211

† Madrid, 1920.

*Miren al Pastorzuelo
que se nos cubre con olor a trigo
y se descubre con olor a cielo.*

(Look at the Little Shepherd,
Who hides from us 'neath the fragrance of Wheat,
But Who betrays Himself by the fragrance of Heaven).

The Augustinian friar, Padre Restituto del Valle, leapt to sudden fame as a religious poet with his Eucharistic Hymn

Cantemos al Amor de los amores
(Let us sing to the Love of all love)—

which he wrote for the International Eucharistic Congress celebrated at Madrid in 1911. Set to stirring music, the hymn has since become a sort of sacred national anthem.

Dom Justo Pérez de Urbel, born in 1895 in the very centre of Old Castile, joined as a boy of twelve the Benedictine community of Silos, near Burgos, and there he was educated, professed a monk, and ordained priest. He has published several learned volumes on monastic history, art, liturgy and hagiology.* He is also a poet. His small book entitled *Et in terra Pax* (1928) contains poetry of a high order. There is, for example, the poem *El Ciprés del Claustro* (The Cypress-tree in the Cloister), a poetical description of monastic life, full of candour and reflecting the deep enjoyment of the Benedictine peace which has inspired it. It has already found a place in several anthologies of Spanish verse.

The youngest of the present-day Spanish poets who have published religious verse is also the greatest: we refer to José María Pemán, an Andalusian, born in 1898. He has written much in prose and in verse always under the inspiration of his two great loves: the Catholic religion and Catholic Spain.

Pemán's poetry, both in his lyrics and in his dramas, is not unworthy of comparison with that of Lope de Vega and Calderón, with whom he has many points of resemblance. Though always profound, the meaning of his verse is perfectly clear and needs no second reading, as the following quotations will show. He ends his *Meditación en la Soledad de Maria* (Meditation on Mary's Solitude) as follows:

*Y séame por piedad,
Señora del Mayor Duelo,
tu soledad sin consuelo
consuelo en mi soledad.*

And grant in thy mercy,
Lady of the Greatest Sorrow,
that thy comfortless solitude
be comfort in my solitude.

* His life of St. Eulogius, Martyr of Cordoba, has been translated into English.

His *Oración* (Prayer to Christ) abounds in thoughts like this :

*Ya sé que estás conmigo porque he visto
en las cosas tu sombra que es la paz.
(I know Thou art with me, for I have seen
in creation Thy shadow, which is peace.)*

A passage which has already become famous is that of the *Divino Impaciente*, where St. Ignatius of Loyola addressed his farewell instructions to St. Francis Xavier in these words :

*La vida interior importa
mas que los actos externos ;
no hay obra que valga nada
si no es del amor reflejo.
La rosa quiere cogollo
donde se agarren sus pétalos*

Interior life avails more
than external activity ;
no work is worth anything
unless it reflect love.
The rose must needs have a heart
to hold together the petals.

*Mézlame de vez en cuando
en el trabajo requiebro
y jaculatorias breves
que lo perfumen de incienso.
Ni el rezo estorba al trabajo
ni el trabajo estorba al rezo.
Trenzando juncos y mimbres
se pueden labrar a un tiempo
para la tierra un cestillo
y un rosario para el cielo.*

Take heed to mix now and again
into your work aspirations
—short and swift ejaculations
which perfume it as with incense.
Prayer never hinders work
nor ever work prevents prayer.
While weaving together osiers and
rushes
at the same time one can fashion
a wicker-basket for the earth
and a rosary for heaven.

This is certainly the Spanish tradition of religious poetry at its very best. Even in his prose Pemán writes as a poet. For example, in describing the havoc caused in modern poetry by agnostic and sceptical systems of philosophy, he says : "Hand in hand Philosophy and Poetry were traitors to Being ; hand in hand they turned their backs on Reality and Existence ; hand in hand, too, in well-merited punishment, they issued in a complex Nihilism."*

We end this review of writers of religious verse in modern Spain with a name which, perhaps, will surprise readers acquainted with twentieth-century Spanish literature : that of Manuel Machado. He is now an old man, for he was born at Seville in 1874, and studied under the anti-Catholic philosopher Giner de los Rios. In his youth Manuel Machado joined in Paris the cosmopolitan crowd of "disillusioned poets" of the

* See *Unos versos, un alma y una época*, Madrid, 1940, p. 133.

early nineties. It was then that he began to publish his successive volumes of lyrics, singing in exquisite Castilian "the utter nothingness of things". Since then he has founded and edited *Renacimiento*, *Revista Ibero-Americana*, *Revista Latina*, etc. In 1938 he was co-opted a member of the Royal Spanish Academy (*La Real Academia Española*), and for that event he prepared his last volume of poems entitled *Horas de Oro: Devocionario Poético* (Golden Hours: A Prayer Book in Verse), in which he explains his own reactions to the recent happenings in Spain: "The poet . . . in these decisive moments of Spanish history, finds in the depths of his own soul the ever-flowing source of Christian piety which runs beneath the surface of the whole of our Spanish history, in spite of all the denials of its foreign-inspired calumniators, and which in the end will be the link—fast and strong—to bind indissolubly together all Spaniards worthy of their Mother Country."*

In one of his Sonnets he thus addresses modern Spain :

*Reniega de una vana pseudociencia ;
vuelve a tu tradición, España mía.
¡ Solo Dios hace mundos de la nada !*
(Turn thy back on a hollow pseudo-knowledge ;
turn to thy own tradition, Spain of mine.
God alone can create worlds out of nothing !)

This note of courage and hope fittingly ends a review of the religious poetry of modern Spain. Poets can also be the Apostles of Christ. Those mentioned above have certainly been that for Catholic Spain. May their work prosper and endure. *Hágalo Dios.*

ROMANUS RIOS, O.S.B.

ERASMUS IN ENGLAND

NO great historical character has challenged the understanding of his modern biographers more successfully than Erasmus. For them he remains in the twentieth century what he was in the nineteenth, an enigma. In fact he was a great pioneer who alone, and far ahead of his contemporaries, achieved an eminence of prophetic thought from whence he clearly discerned the future course of time. And it is not until that foreseen future has become the past that ordinary men and

* *Ibid.*, pp. 108-9.

women will be able, and therefore willing, to acknowledge his greatness.

He was born on the Eve of the feast of SS. Simon and Jude in 1466 : and it would seem certain without the inestimable rights and privileges of honourable birth. This of itself would be sufficient to account for his unduly sensitive nature, although genius, just because it is genius, is apt to be unduly sensitive. A good deal of romance has been woven round the story of his birth by Charles Reade in his great novel *The Cloister and the Hearth*. One fact only seems certain, and that is that his father at some time either before or after his son's birth became a priest. At Gouda, under a master who afterwards was his guardian, he was first taught his Latin Grammar, that language of which even Cicero himself was never a greater master. Then he went to the choir school at Utrecht, and after that to the school at Deventer, which at its height numbered more than two thousand boys, some of them destined to become widely famous. But of Erasmus's own time there we know little, and that unremarkable. His opinion of it, written much later, was summed up in the one word "barbarous", an epithet used by many a sensitive lad of the school to which he owed so much, or so little.

The next step he seems to have been compelled to take was unwise and unfortunate. In 1483 his mother died of the plague at Deventer, and in the year following his father also. He was then sent, with his brother, to a *Domus Pauperum*, or House Preparatory, for the monastic life at Hertogenbosch, kept by the Brethren of the Common Life. Here he remained for two years and then begged to be allowed to go to a University. But the money was not forthcoming. Instead, under the double pressure of his guardian and of a friend of his own age who wanted him as a companion in the monastic life, he entered the novitiate of the Augustinian Canons at Steyn. At the end of his novitiate he was professed in 1488 and for seven years continued in the house of his mistaken choice, if choice it can be called. While there he devoted himself with great diligence to the study of the patristic writers, especially of St. Augustine and St. Jerome. In a letter to a friend written much later, he says : "I have not only read the letters of St. Jerome long ago, but have copied every one of them out with my own fingers." He then goes on to mention his favourite classical authors : "My authorities in poetry are Maro, Horace, Naso, Juvenal, Statius, Martial Claudian, Persius, Lucan, Tibullus and Propertius : in prose, Tully, Quintilian, Sallust, Terence [*sic*]." But now, having availed himself to the full of the intellectual oppor-

tunities of his monastery, he began to feel the restraints of the religious life unbearable. His superiors, being wise, understood this and made it easy for him, now a priest and in his twenty-seventh year, to become Latin secretary to Henry of Bergen, the courtier-like Bishop of Cambrai, who wished for his services on a projected visit to Rome, presumably in the hope of getting for himself a Cardinal's "hat". But something went wrong: the journey did not come off: nor did the "hat" come on.

The Bishop took him back to Brussels, but courtly society did not suit Erasmus. So, with the episcopal blessing and some small monetary aid, he set out for Paris, where, with all its intellectual possibilities, he hoped to live a fuller, freer and, for him, a better life. Though still, of course, an Augustinian Canon, he was now able to go and come at will, and must have greatly rejoiced in the prospect of embracing, at last, his true and learned "vocation".

He reached Paris in the autumn of 1495, and in order to obtain a Doctor's degree in Theology he entered the College of Montaigu, lately revived in reputation by its stern and zealous Principal, John Standonck. But Erasmus, always delicate and fastidious, found the diet there too rough and meagre, and became so ill that he had to return to his friends in Holland in order to recover his health. Returning soon afterwards, his life in Paris took on a more sociable colour, "*Vixit verius quam studii*". He now lived at a rather sumptuous boarding-house in the Latin Quarter, much frequented by well-to-do young Englishmen. Here he made the acquaintance of Lord Mountjoy, who introduced him to his own friends, William Blount, Thomas Grey, and Robert Fisher, a cousin of St. John Fisher. Living under such pleasant conditions was not inexpensive, so he was obliged to take pupils. He seems from the beginning to have been treated with marked respect, and he dates a letter to his prior at Steyn, *E mea bibliotheca*, as if the whole household were his own. In the same letter he dilates upon his devotion to purely theological studies as if wishing to reassure his superior of the correctness of his life. It would appear that some unfriendly gossip about him had reached Holland. But, as he said, a man so frail and delicate as himself was not at all inclined to clerical irregularity. Some, indeed, who little suspected the intensity of his intellectual toil, and only seeing him occasionally, convivial and at ease among his friends, may have thought him self-indulgent. Others, too, who may have had personal experience of his caustic wit, may have reported ill of him. Erasmus was never one to suffer fools gladly.

Meanwhile he continued in Paris, supporting himself precariously by private teaching, and the more so when the help of the Bishop of Cambrai was no longer forthcoming. But he had an unselfish and trusted friend in James Batt, a graduate of Paris who had returned to his own country and become tutor to the son of Anne Borsselen, widow of an Admiral of the Fleet and hereditary Lady of Veere. Such were the kindly offices of this good man exercised on behalf of Erasmus that he was invited to visit the Lady of Veere and from that time received constant monetary assistance at her hands, thus easing his poverty and, what was even more important, giving him time and opportunity to get on with the work he had it in him to do. Such a relation of dependency between a poor but great scholar and a rich widow lady laid him open to criticism from some who had never known, perhaps, what it was to be both scholarly and poor. In fairness to Erasmus it should be remembered that time and again he refused positions of affluence and honour, knowing that whatever he gave to high office would be lost to that cause of sound learning to which he had dedicated his life. "The scandal was not so much that Erasmus begged as that he was forced to do so."*

The writer of these discriminating words has also put his finger upon Erasmus's besetting virtue—his moderation; nay, his passion for moderation. "That," he adds, is approximately what the Greek word *Sophrosyne* means. "It is apt," he continues, "to strike the modern man as a strange or even an impossible emotion. Nevertheless, it was just this emotion which created our European civilization. And whenever civilization breaks down into barbarism it is only by a passion for moderation that it can be rescued and restored. . . . That, at least, was the Greek view, the very definition of barbarism being, for the Greeks, the man who goes to extremes. They thought him a weakling, and they proved they were right by beating him and then making a man of him. The whole ancient morality is based on the conviction that moderation is strength—but moderation at white heat. Now this is exactly what we find in Erasmus."†

Meanwhile (1499) he was more comfortably settled in Paris, better off, in better health, working harder and rapidly making influential friends. But for all that he had a strong aversion to the kind of theological lectures he was obliged to listen to in order to get his degree in divinity. He writes to a friend about them in a mood of superfluous but amusing naughtiness: "I

* J. A. K. Thomson, *Erasmus in Social and Political Ideas of the Renaissance and the Reformation*, p. 156. (Harrap, 1925.)

† Ibid.

would not have you put any wrong interpretation on what I am going to say as against theology, for which, as you know, I have always entertained the greatest respect : I wish only to have a joke at the expense of certain theologists of the present generation whose brains are rotten, their language barbarous, their apprehension dull, their learning thorny, their manners rude, their life mere hypocrisy, and their hearts as black as hell."

Happily, at this dark and midnight hour of his spirit, he had an invitation from Lord Mountjoy, his favourite pupil, to go home to England with him for a holiday. We can picture the delight with which it was accepted, the "barbarous theologists" now well forgotten.

So, in the summer of 1499, Erasmus was carried off on his first visit to England. It is probable that Lord Mountjoy took him to his country house at Bedwell in Hertfordshire and that there he made the acquaintance of some delightful people. He now writes in an altogether different mood. "The Erasmus you once knew is now become a sportsman, no bad rider, a courtier of some practice, who bows with politeness and smiles with grace, all this in spite of himself. If you are wise you will fly over here. To take one attraction out of many, the English girls are divinely pretty and as pleasant, gentle and charming as the Muses. They have one custom which cannot be too much admired. When you go anywhere on a visit the girls all kiss you. They kiss you when you arrive. They kiss you when you go away ; and they kiss you when you return. In fact you are never without kisses. Did you once come over here you would never wish to return again."

But this was by the way, and, though a pleasant exaggeration, no serious matter. That was to follow. For it was in England, and at Oxford, that Erasmus was to have the great purpose of his life made clear to him. Let us follow him, then, as he rides over Shotover and across Milham ford, into Oxford, alone.

As an Austin Canon he had a claim upon the hospitality of the Augustinian College of St. Mary's, founded in 1435 by his Order to enable their more promising younger subjects to profit by University studies, much as our own Orders have done both at Oxford and Cambridge within living memory. Here he stayed for two or three months, meeting learned people and listening to Colet as he lectured on the Epistles of St. Paul—for him, as for others, a new and momentous experience. His own wide learning, ready wit and good talk made him acceptable wherever he chose to go, not least in College Halls and Common Rooms, where he met Colet himself and engaged both his interest and his friendship. But as the result of it all there came home to him

more and more insistently his own great need of a working knowledge of Greek. Colet might urge him to work on the same lines as himself; but Erasmus was convinced, even more than Colet, that without Greek nothing serviceable to sacred Letters could be done. And Greek was not to be had in Oxford, where as yet it was scarcely tolerated by the unco' guid or encouraged by anybody else. The coming of good things is often slow; and the story of how Greek came to England more than a quarter of a century before Erasmus's visit and very, very gradually established itself in our great universities, principally through his own influence and that of St. John Fisher and St. Thomas More will be spoken of later. It is enough to say here that Oxford, always slow to welcome novelties, was particularly so in welcoming so ancient a novelty as Greek at the beginning of the sixteenth century. It is true that in 1311, at the Council of Vienne, the Church itself had recommended that lectures in Greek should be established in the universities of Paris, Bologna, Oxford and Salamanca. But the decree had not been carried out. As Dr. P. S. Allen wrote: "It needs no eyes (now) to see where they were wrong: where they were right—and they were right often enough—can only be seen by taking trouble."*

So Erasmus left Oxford with two valuable gifts—the friendship of Colet, and the knowledge, at least, of what he did not know.

From Oxford he went on to London, where he found other gifts as precious as Greek itself—the friendship of men who understood and appreciated the rare quality of his mind, and, chief among them, Thomas More.

Just then London was far more the centre of new intellectual life than either Oxford or Cambridge; and to Erasmus it brought new hopes and great mental stimulus. Writing to Robert Fisher, he speaks thus of his first stay in England: "I never liked anything so much before. I find the climate both pleasant and wholesome; and I have met with such kindness and so much learning, not hackneyed and trivial, but deep, accurate, ancient Latin and Greek, that but for the curiosity of seeing Italy, I should not bother to go there. When I hear Colet I seem to be listening to Plato himself. In Grocyn, who does not marvel at such a perfect round of learning? What can be more acute, profound and delicate than the judgement of Linacre? What has nature ever created more gentle, more sweet, more happy than the genius of Thomas More?"

Of the first meeting of More and Erasmus evidence is uncertain. One story, at any rate *ben trovato*, is worth the re-telling

* P. S. Allen, *The Age of Erasmus*, pp. 118-19.

even if it be untrue. Being then unacquainted, they were both guests at the Lord Mayor's table and were equally impressed by each other's conversation. Suddenly Erasmus felt sure that the brilliant talk he was listening to could come from no other than More, and exclaimed, "You must be More or no one." More instantly replied, "Then you must be Erasmus or the devil."

But there is another record of their first meeting resting on the authority of Erasmus himself. "Thomas More, who had visited me when I was staying in Mountjoy's country house (in Kent), had taken me out for a walk as far as the next village (of Eltham), for there all the royal children were being educated, Arthur, the eldest, alone excepted. When we came to the Hall, all the retinue were assembled. In the midst stood Henry (afterwards Henry VIII), aged nine, already with a certain royal demeanour; I mean a dignity of mind combined with a remarkable courtesy. Meantime I was a bit annoyed because More had given me no warning, especially as the boy, during dinner, sent me a note asking me to write something." Soon after, however, a poem was written in praise of Henry VII, his children, and his kingdom.

Erasmus could not have seen much of More upon this occasion, for almost immediately he went off to Oxford as the guest of Prior Charnock; but they corresponded, as an only surviving letter shows, and after his Oxford visit he stayed with Lord Mountjoy either in London or at Greenwich for a month previous to his departure for Paris on 27 January, 1500. At Dover he was deprived at the Custom-house of all but two of the twenty pounds he had with him. And it was never recovered, a sore and bitterly remembered conclusion to his first stay in England. From Dover he crossed to Boulogne, visited his friend Batt for two nights at Tournehem and reached Paris on 2 February.

During the five-and-a-half years that followed, Erasmus, being now thirty-five, devoted himself to the study of Greek. "In quest of Greek, in quest of the proper equipment for his life-work, he went back to the old precarious existence, pupils and starvation, the dependence and flattery he loathed."* "My Greek studies are almost too much for my courage," he writes; and again, "It is incredible how my heart burns to bring all my poor lucubrations to completion, and at the same time to attain to some moderate capacity in Greek. I shall then devote myself entirely to the study of sacred literature, as for some time I have longed to do." And once more, "I see it is the merest madness to touch with the little finger that principal part of theology which treats of the divine mysteries without being furnished with the apparatus of Greek . . . I have on my side all the sacred

* P. S. Allen, *The Age of Erasmus*, p. 130.

authority of the Pontifical Council . . . I wish to follow the path to which St. Jerome, with the noble band of so many Fathers, invites us."

In the summer, an outbreak of plague drove him to Orleans, where he continued his Attic drudgery. But a growing sense of mastery over Greek, the indispensable instrument of all his future labours, must now with increasing frequency have broken upon him like sunshine amid all the dullness of his toil.

And then came an abatement in the drudgery itself. In 1502, at Louvain, a new and great inspiration came upon him when, one day after walking to the Abbey of the White Canons at Parc outside the town, he found in their library a manuscript of Annotations by Laurentius Valla on the New Testament. He then made up his mind to make a thorough study of the Bible by comparing it with the Greek versions, and so, as he hoped, he would be able to establish a critical text as the necessary foundation for sound work in theological research. Having trained himself by translating Plutarch's treatises, he then prepared Valla's manuscript for the press, and in 1504, bearing with him the subject of his life-work, he took it to Paris to have it printed. He was now thirty-eight and upon the threshold of great achievements.

At the end of 1505 or at the very beginning of 1506 Erasmus paid his second visit to England. The greater part of it seems to have been spent in London, of which he writes to Colet in the following year, "No place in the world has given me so many friends as your City of London: so true, so learned, so generous, so distinguished, so unselfish, so numerous." It was in London and not at either of the universities that he found the most genuine enthusiasm for learning. For some months he was the guest of Lord Mountjoy, whose London house was near St. Paul's. Mountjoy was then twenty-six, and had been chosen, no doubt on account of his ability and charm, as an elder companion to the young Prince Henry, now fifteen and heir to the throne. So it was that Erasmus found himself very pleasantly included within the royal circle and on easy terms with the distinguished men who were responsible for the government of the country. Thus he came to know William Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury and Chancellor of the Realm, who was to remain his patron and true friend for many years to come. Staying on in London after the departure of the Court, he found more than consolation in the company of Thomas More, recently married to his young wife, Jane Colt, and living at Bucklersbury in the City. Just then More was out of favour with Henry VII on account of his opposition in Parliament to certain money

grants demanded by the King. As a consequence he was freer from business than usual and only too ready to enjoy Erasmus's stimulating friendship. They seem to have spent a good deal of time together in making translations from Lucian's witty dialogues, and these were afterwards published in Paris. But suddenly, out of the blue, there came to him a golden opportunity, the chance of going to Italy, which had for so long been the land of Erasmus's desire.

Per varios casus, per tot discrimina rerum,
Tendimus in Latium.*

Of this visit, so important to his mind and spirit, of the friends he made and of the many persuasions he had to make it his home for the rest of his days, we cannot speak just here. His special literary preoccupation while in Italy was a new edition of his *Adagia*, a collection of Greek and Latin sayings which brought him the friendship of Aldus Manutius, the founder at Venice of the famous Aldine Press. It was published in 1508 and "carried his name far and wide throughout Europe, winning him fame amongst all who had pretensions to scholarship".†

After its publication he visited Rome. But on 22 April, 1509, Henry VII died; and in the second week of May he received an urgent letter from Lord Mountjoy bidding him come to England, now a land of great literary promise opened up to him by the accession of Henry VIII. So, leaving Rome, he obeyed the call and crossed to Dover some time before the approach of autumn.

In a letter written more than twenty years later Erasmus speaks of Cardinal Grimani's more than friendly attempt to keep him in Rome, his last request being that he would pay him one more visit before his departure. "Unfortunately I did not go, fearing that I might be overcome by his eloquence and change my mind. I never made a more unlucky choice. But what can you do when driven by destiny?"‡

During the enforced leisure of his journey to England prolonged by the delay in the arrival of his books, Erasmus composed his *Encomium Moriae*, or Praise of Folly. It was dedicated to More, as its title indicates. But lack of space forbids detailed reference to it just here. Not that it was unimportant; quite the contrary; for it was a brave attempt, like More's own *Utopia*, to correct prevalent abuses in Church and State by wit rather than by war before it was too late. Compared with the sort of thing that was being written in Florence and Rome at the same

* Virgil, *Aeneid*, i, 204-5.

† P. S. Allen, *The Age of Erasmus*, p. 136.

‡ F. M. Nichols, *The Epistle of Erasmus*, i, p. 463.

period, the *Encomium Moriae* was but badinage. There calumny became universal where Filelfo, Poggio, and Lorenzo Valla led the way. Italy had in fact become a school for scandal the like of which the world cannot show, not even in France at the time of Voltaire. And all this malicious folly went on and increased right up to the Sack of Rome in 1527.* After that terrible event, which was looked upon as a judgement of God, slander visibly declined, and along with it "the unrestrained wickedness of private life."†

Having completed the *Encomium Moriae*, Erasmus left London in the April of 1511 in company with Lord Mountjoy, visiting Archbishop Warham at his Palace in Canterbury before crossing the Channel. On 27 April we hear of him in Paris. He returned to London about the middle of May and stayed with Grocyn, a learned English physician and one of the best known of the More circle. In August he had been in close touch with the English Court for more than two years without having obtained any of the benefits to which he had looked forward so confidently before he left Italy. While waiting for something to turn up, he was persuaded by Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and now Chancellor of Cambridge University, to go there and give some lectures in Greek. In his ample correspondence during the ensuing months we get an entertaining picture of his experiences. It is of interest to notice that while Erasmus was in England, inspired no doubt by the friendship of such men as More, Colet and Fisher, Linacre and Grocyn, he produced perhaps the best work of his lifetime. Indeed, at Cambridge he seems to have touched his intellectual high-water mark. Established by Fisher for the time being at Queens' College, his work there was at one and the same time both a failure and a success, seemingly an immediate failure but ultimately a success and even something greatly more than that.

To any casual observer who saw him there he might have appeared to be but a poor neglected foreigner, unable to speak the language of his pupils, wasting his own time, and possibly theirs, in trying to teach them the beggarly elements of Greek Grammar. And from the letters he wrote, particularly to his friend Ammonius during his stay in Cambridge of less than three years, one might think him to have been altogether dissatisfied with the people he had to do with, the food he had to eat, with the wine he had to drink, and with the work he had to

* See St. Thomas More's description, *Dialogue Concerning Tyndale*, E.W., iv, c. vii.

† Buckhardt, *The Renaissance in Italy*, trans., pp. 160-64 *passim*.

do. But it was not so. Never had he worked harder ; and to say that of Erasmus is saying a good deal. It is also true that never were the results of his work more lasting and made more available for the general good. And not only this : during his stay even his own pecuniary straits urged him to unwonted effort. Disappointed in his class-room, he more than made good in his study ; and to his labours there the men of his own generation were indebted for his two most notable achievements, his *Novum Instrumentum*, that is his Greek text of the New Testament with a Latin version of his own and an accompanying commentary, and his edition of St. Jerome, though, of course, both these works were not published until after he had left Cambridge.

But that was not all ; he was busy, too, with the text of Seneca, with translations from St. Basil, with Latin Manuals for St. Paul's School, recently founded by his friend Colet, and with other things as well.

Again, the work done officially while he was at Cambridge was an important part of a great plan conceived by Fisher, both as bishop and Chancellor of the University, to bring about not merely a renewal of letters but also of simple Catholic Faith throughout the country. Preaching and religious instruction were at a very low ebb both at the universities and, as a consequence, almost everywhere else in England. "Neglect of preaching was perhaps the greatest evil of the fifteenth century, and the source of every other."* Edward Lee, Archbishop of York, complains that he does not know twelve secular priests in his diocese who can preach ; and only a few friars, but none of any other religious order.† The sermon was an exception rather than the rule, and a timid policy brought about by the active preaching of the Lollards had encouraged its decline. The clergy in general were directed to preach to their congregations once a quarter, and Latimer relates that sermons might be omitted for twenty Sundays without fear of complaint. And rare as was the sermon, simple exposition of the sacred scripture was rarer still. In their zeal to prevent the growth of cockle the husbandmen had forgotten to sow the wheat. The Lady Margaret preachership was Fisher's eminently practical design to meet this deficiency. He also wanted to make such preaching as there was more simple ; and to this end he encouraged Erasmus to write his treatise *De Ratione Concionandi*. "By the regulation now given in connection with the newly founded preachership, the preacher was required to deliver six sermons annually, that is to say in the course of every two years at each of the following places : on some Sunday at St. Paul's Cross, and once on some

* T. E. Bridgett, *St. John Fisher*, p. 105.

† *Ibid.*, p. 327.

feast day in each of the churches of Ware and Cheshunt in Hertfordshire, Bassingbourne, Orwell and Brabahan in Cambridge-shire; Maney, St. James Deeping, St. John Deeping, Bourne, Boston and Swineshead in Lincolnshire. . . .

"On the whole, looking to the scope of these several designs of the Countess and of Fisher her adviser—the provision of gratuitous instruction in the university, the direct application of the learning thus acquired in sermons to the laity—and the introduction of a more simple and evangelical method of scriptural exposition—we can scarcely deny Fisher's claim to rank with the [Catholic] theological reformers of his own and the preceding age, with Gerson, Hegius, Rudolph Lange, and Rudolphus Agricola."*

Like St. Thomas More, St. John Fisher has won the unstinted admiration not only of Catholics but also of non-Catholics who have known enough of his work to realize his greatness of soul. Witness once more the writer already quoted: "Fisher was at this time almost omnipotent at Cambridge . . . and it would have been perhaps impossible to find in an equal degree, in any one of his contemporaries, at once that moderation, integrity of life, and disinterestedness of purpose which left the bigot no fault to find, and that liberality of sentiment and earnest desire for reform which conciliated far bolder and more advanced thinkers. Over Erasmus . . . a character so saintly and yet so sympathizing exercised a kind of spell. Of all men whom he ever knew, Fisher seems to have most inspired his reverence and regard. To Fisher's influence he attributes all that is most hopeful and encouraging in the university: to Fisher Cambridge was indebted for the peaceful introduction of Greek, and for that salutary effort on behalf of theological learning—the Lady Margaret professorship, to which he himself had been appointed; he praises with special emphasis the Lady Margaret professor preachership, as opposed to the prevailing artificial style of pulpit oratory; of Fisher himself he observes that he preserved the golden mean—neither adhering doggedly to the ancient learning nor siding with those who were wishing to set all traditional studies aside; he describes him as one in whom were united the highest attainments and the most blameless character; and in whom every virtue that became a bishop was combined in an extraordinary degree. On the other hand, it was equally evident that Fisher was not less influenced, though in a different manner, by his successor in the professorial chair. Of the moderation which Erasmus so much admired in his patron he was himself a conspicuous example. The good bishop took heart in his

* J. B. Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*, C.U.P., 1873, pp. 439-40 *passim*.

advocacy of the new learning, when he found the foremost scholar of the age not less ready to denounce the profanity of Italian sceptics than the degeneracy of the mendicant orders, and able to discuss with masterly discrimination the merits of classical authors and to recognize the real value of the writings of St. Jerome. The various evidence indeed which we find of their interchange of opinions on such subjects would seem to indicate that Erasmus's influence over Fisher, and through him over Cambridge at large, was far greater than their respective biographers would lead us to suppose. . . ."

Nor was the good influence of Erasmus at Cambridge confined to that which he exercised over St. John Fisher. There was Henry Bullock, a fellow of Queens' College, mathematical lecturer and afterwards Vice-Chancellor. In him he found an enthusiastic pupil while in residence and a valued correspondent when far away. "Bullock it was who, along with one or two others, sustained the tradition of Greek learning in the perilous interval between his preceptor's departure and the arrival of Richard Croke; and somewhat later we find his talents and attainments earning him the notice of Wolsey, by whom he was induced to enter the lists against the Lutheran party, and was rewarded by a chaplaincy in the Cardinal's household. Another student for whom Erasmus entertained real regard was William Gunnell, also afterwards one of Wolsey's household, and at one time tutor in the family of Sir Thomas More. There was also a young fellow of King's, whom he styles *doctissimus* and *carissimus*—of the name of John Bryan, who subsequently attracted to himself no little criticism in the university, as an assertor of the more genuine Aristotle of the Humanists as against the traditional Aristotle of the schoolmen. Another fellow of the same foundation was Robert Aldrich, the *juvenis blandae cujusdam eloquentiae*, who accompanied Erasmus to Walsingham . . . and who lived to become Bishop of Carlisle . . . and a commissioner against heretics in Queen Mary's reign. There was also Dr. Fawne, his successor in the Lady Margaret professorship, and Richard Whitford [whom Harpsfield calls More's familiar friend] who used to call More and Erasmus 'the twins', chaplain to Fox, Bishop of Winchester and afterwards one of the fathers of the Brigettine community of Sion."†

From all this it will be seen how greatly St. John Fisher was influenced by Erasmus in his schemes for the betterment of English Catholic life and how the several young men whom he taught at Cambridge remained true to the Faith to the end of their days. Furthermore, it is sufficient to show that his personal

* *Loc. cit.* pp. 439–500 *passim*.

† *Loc. cit.* pp. 439–500 *passim*.

influence while at the university was in no way connected with the fact that a few years later Cambridge University became so conspicuously Protestant. Erasmus's real influence was in another direction. He went to Cambridge to teach Greek; and seven years later he could write: "*In utraque traduntur Graecae litterae, sed in Cantabrigia tranquille*". Greek was taught both in Oxford and Cambridge, but in Cambridge, as contrasted with Oxford, "*tranquille*".*

The work Fisher had given him to do was done. The study of Greek had quietly become a part of the University curriculum. But to foster incipient Protestantism was not then or at any other time Erasmus's wish. What he wished to do was to free the Church from ignorance and corruption; but that was because he was a good Catholic and not because he was a bad one. As More himself later on pointed out to Tyndale, the difference between Erasmus's work and his own was that Erasmus tried to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem whereas Tyndale himself did his best to destroy them.

In September 1513 the plague had broken out at Cambridge and Erasmus took refuge with his friends the Gunnells at Landbeach not far away. But in the January following he seems to have made up his mind to return to the Continent, and there superintended the printing of the work he had achieved for the most part during his time in Cambridge.

Though he made two other visits to England they were of short duration, and the rest of his life was spent mostly between Basle and Louvain and Friburg-in-Breisgau carrying on the good work which he had begun in England, and of which I hope to write more fully in a book to be entitled *Erasmus, Tyndale and More*.

W. E. CAMPBELL.

ST. HILDEGARD

IT is often believed, even by Catholics, that in the "Dark" Ages of Faith women were kept under lock and key, in abysmal ignorance of anything but cooking and childbearing, and that only the "emancipation" of the nineteenth century put an end to their slavery. History, however, tells us exactly the opposite. When Europe was still united in one Faith, the Church allowed no

*P. S. Allen, *Erasmii Epistolae*, tom. iii, p. 346.

man to forget that God was born of a Woman; and after Our Lady she honoured holy virgins and widows, martyrs and confessors. Was she likely to despise the living, who were so many potential Saints? It is true, she kept St. Paul's injunction: "*Mulier taceat in ecclesia*"—but this silence was strictly confined to the Church as the place of the Divine Sacrifice—everywhere else she was allowed to raise her voice—even to reproach bishops and priests.

St. Hildegard of Bingen belongs to that spiritual family of valiant women from which came St. Catherine of Sienna and St. Joan of Arc, the holy German Empress Adelheid and the first Christian dramatist of Europe, Hrotsvith of Gandersheim. She was born at Spanheim, in the Palatinate, towards the close of the eleventh century. She had her first vision at the tender age of three, and entered the religious life at the Benedictine convent of Mount Disibode when she was eight. Her visions and revelations continued throughout her life, and her advice was eagerly sought by persons from all ranks of society. Perhaps her most famous correspondent was the German Emperor Barbarossa, whom—as most of her other clients, including the higher clergy and the Pope himself—she vigorously exhorted to mend his life and do penance. The proud Emperor, autocratic though he was, bowed before the spiritual authority of the humble nun whose exhortations were accompanied by predictions that came true.

St. Hildegard evidently had the "gift of prophecy" in a remarkable degree. The punishments she foretold for the negligence of the clergy have often been thought to refer to the Reformation. Speaking in the person of the Church, the Saint thus warned the priests: "The Princes and peoples will fall upon you, priests, who have neglected me for so long, they will cast you off and put you to flight, and take away your riches because you have not fulfilled the duties of your priestly office." This concise description certainly fits the events of the Reformation exactly. To quote the Bollandist editor of her works: "If there is any person in the Middle Ages who, according to the judgement of many authorities, is certain to have enjoyed divine revelations, it is St. Hildegard." For not only St. Bernard, but also three Popes, Eugene II, Anastasius IV and Hadrian IV as well as the Council of Trèves were agreed that her revelations were true and that her doctrine came from God.

St. Hildegard herself claimed that all her knowledge was infused and came to her in visions. As a matter of fact the visionary state was, as it were, normal to her, beginning at the age of three and remaining with her throughout her life. This is how she

describes it: "I see my visions not in dreams, or sleeping, or in my brain (*in phrenesi*), nor with my bodily eyes or the ears of the outer man, nor in hidden places, but I have received them waking, looking round—according to the will of God—in a pure mind with the eyes and ears of the inner man, openly." Her visions, then, differ in many respects from those of other mystics—any way this kind of visions, for there was another which will be dealt with later. They were not, as in the case of St. Teresa, for example, transitory, but an uninterrupted state. They were not accompanied by abnormal physical phenomena such as trance or elevation. They were, on the contrary, as ordinary as things seen by her bodily eyes and did not hinder her usual occupations—there seems to have been no trace of "ligature". When, as a child, she first discovered that other people did not see the things she saw she was deeply distressed, and from that time hid them carefully from all except her spiritual advisers and confidants.

She describes this visionary state as a light which she always sees in her soul, a light that is not in a place, and is far brighter than a cloud through which the sun shines, and which has

neither height nor length nor breadth. And this is called the shadow of the living light (*umbra viventis luminis*). And just as sun, moon and stars appear in the water, so scriptures and sermons, virtues and certain deeds of men I see reflected in it. And whatever I see or learn in that vision I remember for a long time . . . but what I do not see thus, that I know not, for I am, as it were, illiterate.

It would, then, almost seem as if all the Saint's knowledge came to her in the same way as it comes to the blessed in Heaven, who see all things in God. Yet, as P. Poulain* remarks: "It is impossible to admit that all that this Saint wrote came from God. For her works are full of scientific errors, and exactly those errors that were prevalent in the twelfth century." On the other hand, it is a fact that she had never learnt Latin and yet knew the sense of passages from the Bible and the Fathers which she was reading, and even dictated in that language with the help of a secretary who corrected the grammar. Though we may admit that she probably "picked up" more than she herself realized from books and conversations, the supernatural origin of her knowledge can hardly be denied—not only because there is no reason to doubt her own testimony, but also because, as we shall see, her mystic doctrine is always in strict accordance with the greatest doctors that came after her, especially St. Thomas and St. John of the Cross.

But if most of her knowledge was, indeed, infused, why was she allowed to deceive herself and to regard as divine truth what

* P. Poulain, S.J. *The Graces of Interior Prayer*, ch. xxi, 25f.

was but the erroneous hypothesis of her day? P. Poulain offers an attractive solution of this difficult problem:

In order to explain in a favourable light St. Hildegard's illusions on scientific subjects, we may admit the following hypothesis: God, it seems, may supernaturally convey into a person's mind a portion of the knowledge of the day . . . whilst giving in some way a general warning that He does not guarantee the contents of this whole, and that it is therefore to be accepted only at the receiver's risk.

This would adequately explain why she was allowed to err on scientific matters, but not on things pertaining to salvation.

Apart from this, as it were "normal" visionary state, St. Hildegard enjoyed another kind of vision which, however, was rare.

Sometimes, she tells us, I see in this (the "ordinary") light another light, which is called the living light—Whilst I behold this light all sadness and sorrow leave my memory, so that I feel like a young girl, and not like an elderly woman.

It is always dangerous to apply a hard and fast terminology to the different mystic states of different souls. It seems, however, that this latter kind of "vision" was more in the nature of what is usually called infused contemplation, in which the impression of light is frequently present to the imagination.* She describes one of these states, which were quite different from her "ordinary" visions, in very much the same manner as St. Teresa does her trances:

I saw a mystic and wondrous vision, she says, so that all my inner parts were shaken, and the sensibility of my body was extinguished; my consciousness was turned into another mode, as if I knew not myself.

This is certainly something essentially different from that other state in which she normally received her revelations. It would seem that here we have to do with the real *Unio Mystica* (accompanied by trance), the supernatural state *quoad essentiam*, the highest development of sanctifying grace; whereas the other state in which the Saint saw but "the shadow of the living light" and acquired natural knowledge by supernatural means, would, to use the words of St. Thomas once more, be supernatural only *quoad modum*. It is one more proof of the divine origin of the Saint's visions that she herself knew the apparently so much more "supernatural" gift of prophecy to be of an inferior order—in full accord with the Thomist doctrine of the superiority of sanctifying grace (reaching its culmination in infused con-

* Cf. P. Garrigou-Legrange, O.P. *Perfection chrétienne et Contemplation*, where he says, in dealing with infused contemplation: "Souvent il suffit d'avoir dans l'imagination l'impression d'une lumière". See this work on the whole question of Mystic Union and *gratia gratis data*.

templation) to the *gratia gratis data* of prophecy and other extraordinary gifts.

This differentiation between prophetic vision and mystic contemplation is reflected in St. Hildegard's written work, especially in the *Scivias*.

The bulk of the *Scivias*—which, we are told, were written at the express command of God—contains very elaborate descriptions of visions comparable in form to those of the prophet Ezechiel and of St. John. They are always followed by minute allegorical interpretations which are often combined with moral exhortations. Thus, in the First Vision of the *Scivias*, the Saint sees One sitting on a mountain—which denotes the stability of the Kingdom of God—denouncing the tepidity of men. She sees in these visions angels and animals, stars and rivers, Anti-Christ and The Woman—but these are externals. In the often fantastic descriptions there is enshrined pure Christian doctrine on an amazing variety of subjects, showing a theological insight truly supernatural in an unlearned woman.

Perhaps the most astonishing fact is the absence of all emotion in these visions. They are permeated with a deep love of God and zeal for souls, but a love that has its seat entirely in the will, not in the feelings. In vain do we look for descriptions of loving intercourse between Christ and the soul such as abound in the lives of St. Gertrude and St. Margaret Mary. With the great mediaeval Benedictine all is restraint and austerity. Her life is dominated by the knowledge that man is an *animal rationale*, and that the intellect is God's loftiest gift to him. In the midst of her visionary world of allegorical beings she rings the changes on this great theme as if she were a disciple of the Angelic Doctor. "But thou, O man, sayest : I cannot do good. But I say, thou canst. Thou askest : how ? I answer : By intellect and reason." (*Intellectu et ratione.*) The Saint does not, of course, teach that man can do good on his own account. It is God who works in him. But in truly Thomist manner she explains that God has constituted man in such a way that He works through the human reason which He has given man for the express purpose of shewing him "what is good and what evil".

She insists on the freedom of the will as if she were answering an imaginary Luther or Karl Barth, or those modern psychologists who would persuade us that we must follow our inclinations wherever they may lead us !

But if you say you cannot do good works—that you say in your iniquity. For you have eyes to see, ears to hear, a heart to think, hands to work and feet to walk . . . thus has God created you. Wherefore also resist the desires of your flesh and God will help you.

"Resist the desires of your flesh . . ." St. Hildegard, like all true mystics, knew how indispensable is asceticism to the Christian life. She calls it the "Mother of virtue", and places it at the beginning of the *Via Mystica*. Her mysticism, like her doctrinal teaching, is austere, and much of it reads like an anticipation of St. John of the Cross. In the fourth Vision of the *Scivias* she gives a wonderful description of the Mystic Way. The soul, seeking her lost home, asks the eternal question of man: "Where am I wanderer? In the shadow of death. In what way do I walk? In the way of error. Which consolation have I? The comfort of a wanderer." Then, far away, she hears the call of Sion, her Mother, the call to the life of prayer. She follows the voice, but the way is hard, and she nearly gives up the venture, when her Mother tells her that God has given her wings to fly. She takes courage and comes to a "tabernacle" which protects her from the arrows of her enemies. The tabernacle probably means something like Meister Eckhart's "*castellum*", the inner sanctuary of the soul where God Himself dwells. Outward temptations cannot follow her there, but the Devil now uses subtler weapons, firing her thirst for knowledge and her ambition. This attack, too, is overcome, and the soul begins at last to walk in the way of godliness. And now she enters into the higher way, the way of the passive purgations, and what the Saint writes about that might almost be taken from *The Dark Night of the Soul*:

I wish to ascend beyond my intellect and to begin what I cannot accomplish. But when I attempt this a great sorrow comes over me, so that I perform no work in high sanctity nor in the fulness of good will, but feel nothing within myself but the unrest of doubt and despair. Wherefore also this iniquity attacks me, that all happiness, all good both in man and God becomes wearisome and distasteful to me.

The way of the Cross was the way of St. Hildegard no less than that of all other mystics. Her visionary state was no obstacle to the feeling of utter misery and desolation, and the "dark night of the spirit" was her portion as it was the portion of St. John of the Cross.

I appear to myself, she writes, in the inner part of my soul as ashes of ashes, and as dust in my instability, therefore I sit trembling like a feather. But do not cut me off from the land of the living, because in the vileness of my stupidity I think myself in the lowest and vilest place so that I am not worthy to be called human.

But the Saint knows that this purification is necessary for her perfection. For God has revealed to her that He casts men into this desolation "thus taking away from them their elation, nor

permitting them to know what hidden good is in them, because I want to produce much fruit in them". In the darkness of this "night" the soul learns true humility, and humility, says St. Hildegard, is to charity what the body is to the soul—they can never be separated in this life. For God is apprehended in faith by a contrite heart—there is no "vision" of Him as long as we live in this body. St. Hildegard then did not deceive herself about the nature of her graces—she knew they were extraordinary gifts, to be received with humility, but she knew also the difference between the order of grace and the order of glory, for, like St. Teresa, St. John of the Cross and the other geniuses of the mystic life, she had received the gift of wisdom with the gift of contemplation—than which there is no surer sign to discern true mysticism from false.

It is probably because the pearls of her wisdom are scattered here and there among her fantastic descriptions of the things she saw that St. Hildegard is so little known as a mystic. Yet the holy Abbess was a worthy precursor of the great mystics of the fourteenth century, St. Mechtild and Eckart, Tauler and Suso and deserves to be honoured in their company the more as the Church has set the seal to her orthodoxy. Though, strangely, she has never been actually canonized she is allowed the title of Saint, and her feast is kept on September 17.

H. C. GRAEF.

CATHOLICISM AND THE REFORM OF SOCIAL INSURANCE

THOSE who study closely the latest trend of social insurance organization and administration all over the world will recognize that never in the last decades has the Catholic Church had a more hopeful opportunity to enlighten and stimulate social progress by asserting her earliest and most traditional principles. Social insurance, as most social services, is rapidly drawing away from the sphere of commercialization in almost all industrial countries. It is more and more developed on the principle of collective liability of employers and employees under some scheme of State or Government guidance and control. The Union of South Africa, to name an instance, is one of the recent newcomers in this field, having introduced Workmen's Compensation legislation on a common liability principle with a common compensation fund. This principle has been that of the

early religious, and the later trade guilds. The long-dated connection between modern social insurance institutions and the old guild principle is even, in some cases, still visible in our own time; the communal sickness fund of the town of Lucerne, for instance, which was organized in 1914, traces its antecedents back to a mediaeval brotherhood of the "Bachelor Journeymen".

The Catholic Church had developed such institutions on an extended family principle. And the guilds, on their part, before they degenerated from their earlier development, considered themselves as a family with social duties incumbent collectively on every member. Modern social development drew away from this conception. It considered the individual worker as the object of legislation. But in our days we observe the return to the family notion. "Sickness insurance," so writes the International Labour Office in a recent survey, "is becoming a family matter, and this is one of the most interesting aspects of the matter." Catholicism has never held another view.

The movement towards the creation of a "general medical service" for the nation reminds us that it was the Catholic Church in England which, for a long period, provided, though on a primitive basis, such a service through the monasteries; these indeed, with their infirmaries and rest-houses, their well-laid-out herbal gardens and their special provisions for the sick poor, were the embryo of such a national service in a time when it was not provided by other agencies. The earliest hospitals in Britain were of Catholic origin, and were certainly designed as a social service. It should not be forgotten that the nursing service goes back to early Catholic institutions, and that even Florence Nightingale was animated in her work by what she had seen of the achievements of French Catholic Sisters in the Crimea. Again, in Germany, in 1830, a Protestant Pastor at Kaiserswerth, near Duesseldorf, set about imitating the Roman Catholic nursing orders of the Counter-reformation.

In our days the conception is gaining ground that with all social insurance services which deal with sick persons, such as industrial accident and health insurance, it should be, as the International Labour Office expressed it not long ago, the "principal object to restore health and working capacity, and cash payments should be secondary". The great poor law administration under Elizabeth and the first Stuarts, who were still largely influenced by Catholic principles in regard to the poor, were not less directed to "set the poore at worke" by providing them with material or even land. The idea was certainly similar to that of the modern "occupational care" and "placing" in contrast to mere unemployment benefit and the workhouse. The

latter has certainly been a non-Catholic invention. Catholicism has never looked upon the poor and destitute as persons stigmatized within the social order; it has far more entertained the modern conception that at least some unemployment is due to circumstances outside the influence of the worker himself. The earliest Catholic writers on social matters have expressed the view that a working man was to be regarded as a "poor" man (*mercenarii pauperes sunt*), because he had no property; as a very erudite scholar of the Catholic University of Fribourg has proved, the expression "labouring poor" in England was definitely based upon this conception. Such "lack of property" seemed to necessitate social assistance in every type of contingency.

It was in a later period—after 1660—that poverty became a matter of contempt and the poor came to be regarded as outcasts of society, that the workhouse was created as a means of correction and that the social service idea of mediaeval days vanished. "Abolish the workhouse" is a cry which should always have appealed to social Catholicism.

With the workhouse came, as another stigma on the poor, the pauper funeral and the common interment. The desire to avoid this shame, which had not been known in the time of guilds, led to the business of Industrial Assurance, which today receives some £60-70,000,000 a year in premiums for this purpose. In most countries burial benefit is included under health insurance schemes, such as National Health Insurance. In England it was expressly excluded from it in 1911. Perhaps the time should now have arrived to do away with the pauper funeral and revert to a brotherly and collectively administered burial on a social service scale. Catholicism has always objected to expensive and showy funerals. They are, however, not less contemptible than the grave of the "pauper whom nobody owns".

The points mentioned may, perhaps, show how far the reform of social insurance, in its general administrative outlook as well as in its individual sections, may in future be imbued with the spirit and principles of Catholic Christianity. The deepest stratum of this attitude will always be the underlying organic conception of the social order which is characteristic to Catholic thinking. This order draws away from the atomistic and individualistic conception of man which leaves the single worker to the chaos of competition, the survival of the fittest and a hidden hand which by some unknown law is to restore some reasonable balance. The Catholic conception has always been, in contrast to this economic philosophy, that of a social organism to be ruled, so far as the secular side was concerned, by

organic communities, such as the family, the guild, the collective organization of trade groups under the superior guidance of the State. It is to this organization that the whole recent trend of social insurance organization has been moving. It will mean the eclipse of the commercialization of what ought to be social services. It is an aim which permeates the great labour movements of our days and the work of the International Labour Office. But while these movements start from a merely rational conception of the matter, fortified by the ever increasing influence of workers as a "class", the Catholic Church may draw her policy from her earliest conception of the dignity of human life, asserted anew in *Rerum Novarum*: in other words, from the fundamentals of spiritual and ethical thought, regardless of class interests.

HERMANN LEVY.

MEDIAEVAL VILLAGE LIFE

ONE of the most fruitful and diverting sources from which the present-day historian may glean details of the life of mediaeval people is the report of an episcopal visitation. If one of our present bishops were to commission his messenger to travel the length and breadth of his diocese, empanelling in every parish a jury of good and trustworthy persons from whom he should enquire as to the general behaviour and conduct of their parish; if, furthermore, the bishop's messenger were accompanied by a stenographer or two who took down the report made by each parochial jury, and those reports were then put together and published as a sort of episcopal Blue Book, the probability is that that report would be far more sensational than any novel. Numerous copies of reports of this very kind have survived from as far back as the fourteenth century, and none are richer in human interest than those which date from mediaeval times. They paint a picture of village life which can scarcely be surpassed for its interesting variety of detail.

Such a report was discovered in the archives of Hereford Cathedral by the late Canon Bannister. It gives details of a visitation made by commissioners appointed by the Bishop in the year 1397, and has been printed in full, in its original Latin, in the *English Historical Review*. In many parishes the local juries were able to make the barren but happy statement that all was well with them, that they had no complaints or criticisms to make of anyone, but usually one finds enumerated in this report the immoralities and minor sins of the parishioners, the failings of

the parish clergy, and any other activities of which they, the jurors, disapproved.

The parish priests of the time came in for a great deal of criticism—they were, on the whole, an unpopular class in mediaeval England. The Bishop of Hereford, fifty years earlier, was obliged to intervene firmly on behalf of his clergy, many of whom were being attacked by their parishioners and their homes plundered. The most common complaint against the clergy was that they neglected their duties. They not only allowed the church buildings to fall into disrepair, but even discouraged their parishioners from taking steps to preserve the fabric of the church. In innumerable parishes the complaint runs: The chancel is in need of repair, and this reflected on the vicar, one of whose duties it was to look after the church buildings. The priests often showed scant respect for the church—they failed to keep the churchyard locked, they removed stones and trees from it for their own private use. Some used it as a grazing ground for their sheep and cattle, with the result that vestments were fouled during processions. Sometimes they stored their hay in the belfry, and kept their cattle in the church itself. It is not surprising, in the light of these revelations, that the laity should also very often be lacking in the due and proper respect for the sanctity of the church. Swearing, quarrelling, and brawling in church during services was fairly common, and a few cases occur in this report of garrulous women who held up the service by loud talk and slanderous remarks. Church ornaments were sometimes stolen, but we can almost forgive the poor peasant who "borrowed" the liturgy and took it home with him so as to learn to read. The copy was restored, but in a very grubby and tattered state.

The priests often failed to conduct the services in a proper manner, or failed to conduct them at all. The bells were not rung, parish visiting not done, baptisms and christenings not performed. Burials, however, were more remunerative, and one parish priest was guilty of an excess of zeal, as it were, when he buried three corpses which should properly have been buried by the rector of the neighbouring parish—"*usurpat sepulturam parochianorum de Lanwran, et spoliavit Rectorem ibidem de tribus corporibus*", runs the report. Rights of burial were much coveted by both regular and secular clergy everywhere at that time, and clerical greed in this respect was often carried to amazing lengths. (See G. G. Coulton's *Five Centuries of Religion*, Volume III, page 215.) The vicar of Peterchurch was too old and feeble to perform his duties adequately, and would not find a chaplain to do them for him. The Warden of St. Katherine's Hospital at Ledbury did not provide food for thirteen poor

people, as he should, and instead of five chaplains, he maintained only two. The priest of Garway was said to be unfitted for his position because he could speak no Welsh, which was the language of most of his parishioners.

The moral character and the behaviour of the parish clergy called forth a great deal of criticism. John the chaplain of Saint Weonard's was in the habit of frequenting taverns and shocking the taproom with his loose talk. Several others were accused of the same vice, and many more of immoral conduct. Avarice in a variety of forms was repeatedly exposed; two chaplains at Leominster were engaged in the buying and selling of sheep, and one was said to have made as much as five shillings profit by the purchase and quick sale of a flock of sheep. The report also mentions one case of clerical usury; the vicar of Yazor lent the sum of 3*s.* 4*d.* to one of his parishioners, and took twelve pullets as interest, and lent the same man a further sum of 1*s.* 8*d.*, this time taking two pounds of oats by way of interest. But the most unscrupulous device for wrongful gain was that adopted by the vicar of Colwall, who forged the will of a woman who died intestate, and appointed himself as executor. The rector of Bishop's Frome soon regretted the burst of generosity which had induced him to promise to subscribe £5 towards the building of a new belfry, and by the time his parishioners had taken down the old one he had thought better of it and declined to give a penny.

The shortcomings of the clergy led to a great deal of unpleasantness with some of the parishioners. The Boley family in particular bore some grudge against the clergy. In Ashperton, John Boley accused the priest of frequenting taverns, but other parishioners declared the accusation to be false. William Boley chased the same priest out of church one Sunday, and refused to pay his tithes and oblations. And it was over the bier of a dead Boley that the vicar of Eardisley pronounced, to the horror of all who heard him, "Lie there, excommunicate!"

Lack of due respect towards the church has already been referred to. Some churches were littered with hemp and other commodities which certain parishioners sold there. One land-hungry villager attempted to encroach upon the churchyard by constructing a hedge round a part of it. The crowning indignity to church property was inflicted by one William Staunton of Ganarew. The rector had died, and, the living being left vacant for six months or more, William moved into the rectory and opened an alehouse there. It is not surprising that attendance at church should suffer. Working and trading on Sunday were common offences. At Leominster people took to attending low

mass on Sundays so that they could have more time to devote to other more agreeable occupations. But the Bishop got wind of this subterfuge and made arrangements to circumvent it.

Working on Sundays was one of the most common methods by which the villagers were wont to earn a little spare money. They would go to a neighbouring manor or town to work for a penny or two, or to trade. But this was pecuniary advantage hardly won, for the lot of the mediaeval peasant was a toilsome one at best, and Sunday was to most a day of rest indeed. Usury was a less laborious and more profitable method of augmenting resources. In Church Stoke there was an usurer who exacted interest at the rate of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent; he had been paid 5s. each year for six years by way of interest on a loan of 15s. This village contained no less than nine persons—all Welshmen—who were alleged to be practising usury in the year 1397. But none of the instances of usury mentioned in the Bishop's report involved any large sums of money; with these rustic Shylocks moneylending was obviously not a full-time occupation, but a profitable sideline for those who had a few marks to spare for the needs of impecunious neighbours. Usury was nevertheless regarded as a sin, and the profits of the village usurer were gained at the price of his good name and his popularity among his fellows.

The relations between lord and tenant were not generally cordial. Their interests were too conflicting for amity and concord, and the tenants took every opportunity to encroach upon the rights and privileges of their lord. The records of the manorial courts are full of cases in which tenants are fined for pasturing their cattle on the lord's hayfield, stealing his corn, or cutting down his trees. The Bishop of Hereford's woods at Ross and the royal forest of Haywood were constantly being despoiled. The seizure of the Mortimer lands by the Crown in 1322 presented the tenants with a golden opportunity that was not missed; several large bands of men hunted in the extensive Mortimer woods and chases, and the constable in charge of the estates, realizing that he could not cope with such numbers, accepted the situation philosophically and took his own men hunting. But retribution overtook him; the king was informed of his depredations, and he was removed from office. The Bishop's lands were often poached not only by his tenants, but by his own bailiffs, and even by the parish clergy.

The report of 1397 sheds some lurid light on the domestic life of the peasantry. The conditions in which the cottars and the smaller freemen and villeins lived were extremely squalid, and the domestic life of the villagers does not

present a very agreeable picture. There was a great deal of adultery and desertion. A very common case was that of the man who expelled his wife from his home, and introduced into it another woman with whom he proceeded to live in sin. One would appreciate a little more light on these domestic dramas, to learn on which side the blame lay; no man, for instance, could be blamed for leaving such a woman as Agnes, wife of Richard, of Donnington parish, who "spread malicious rumours concerning her neighbours and caused much strife by her talk". But neither did her husband Richard lead an altogether blameless life. The church ornaments were in his keeping, but he refused to hand them over when the parishioners demanded them; he also kept for himself a quantity of oats which had been collected for a fund for repairing the cemetery. In reading the report, however, it is necessary to remember that such a document as this throws into high relief the seamy side of village life; the majority of villagers led lives that escaped the censorious notice of the parish juries empanelled by the Bishop's officials.

The mediæval peasant's leisure hours were given over to amusements or pastimes which varied from extremes of violence to the comparatively harmless pursuit of gazing at miracle plays. Brawling and thieving and adultery were rife, and took the place of the less crude diversions of later centuries. The records of manorial court rolls show how common were brawling and pilfering, often accompanied by bloodshed. Occasionally it became a business rather than a diversion. There was a family band of thieves among the Welsh of Kilpeck, eight miles south of Hereford. The ringleaders were Agnes and Roger Bodenham, and it was they who conceived the crimes which their relations or servants were prevailed upon to commit. Gwilym, their son-in-law, at their instigation entered the house of John ap Rees, and drove away four of his oxen, at the same time putting such fear upon John that he "darnot in no wise dwelle in his hous ne occupie his lande fro drede of deth". At Wormeton they kidnapped William ap Hugh and held him to ransom. Recourse to legal process against these marauders was apparently futile. One of the band was caught and arrested while stealing a horse from Miles Higgins. He was taken to Hereford for trial, but Agnes and Roger very quickly obtained his release and turned their attention to the unfortunate Miles. They drove away his cattle and held them until he had paid them twenty shillings and had solemnly promised to keep silence, "peyn of cuttyng of his throte".

The village taverns were well patronized, even by the clergy, and many were the complaints of the good people of the diocese

of Hereford against the drunkenness of various villagers, and the resultant rowdyism in the parish at nights. The foresters of the Bishop's lands in the neighbourhood of Ross indulged in the systematic drinking bouts known as *scotales*. It is interesting to note that the complaints were all directed against the patrons, and not against the taverns themselves; the innkeepers and alewives as a class escaped censure, the odium falling entirely upon those who had partaken too freely of their brew.

Pleasure of a more edifying nature was provided by the miracle plays, which came round from time to time, and were held in the churchyards. But they ceased to edify when they degenerated, as they sometimes did, into ribald displays seasoned with evil jesting, highly entertaining to the ungodly, but deeply disturbing to the devout feelings of the faithful.

The telling of stories, a lost art now, but popular then, was much indulged in, and the man with a tale to tell could always be sure of an attentive audience. The writings of Walter Map, himself a Herefordshire man, reveal that the countryside was rich in superstitious lore. He tells the story of the English knight, Sir William Laudun, who successfully laid the ghost of a Welshman recently deceased, which returned to its native village at night and summoned certain villagers by calling out their names. It was discovered that everyone thus summoned died within three days. Sir William thereupon sought the counsel of no less a person than the Bishop of Hereford, who advised the decapitation of the corpse. This advice was followed, but without effect; the ghost still made his nocturnal visits, and the villagers continued to succumb, until Sir William, lying in wait for the apparition, was able to attack it and split its head open down to the neck. After this the ghost gave no further trouble. This story is merely one local example of the widespread belief in the evil potentialities of the dead. Walter Map has a fund of such stories, and his mind is steeped in legend and tale, many of which reflect the strong belief in superstitions common among mediaeval people. Amicia Daniel of Cradley was accused by the parishioners of practising sorcery. Alison Brown of Bromyard was a witch who was believed to be able to put curses on people with great effect. And John the chaplain of Kilpeck was said to commune with evil spirits at night. But although the rustics had a wholesome fear of witchcraft, they were scandalized rather than moved to fear when Nicholas Cutler of Ruardean declared that his father's ghost walked o' nights, and when he kept nocturnal vigil over his father's grave.

Such then is the picture of village life in mediaeval England as depicted in the returns of the episcopal visitation of the diocese

of Hereford in that year of grace 1397. The picture is not complete, because the reports dwell on the failings and peccadilloes of the village folk rather than on their everyday virtues, and the lay characters that flit through its pages are drawn from the less desirable elements in the rural population. The parish clergy by their manifold failings at least served the purpose of providing an opportunity for the ever-popular pastime of grumbling. But however one-sided an impression is gained from such sources, it is nevertheless an extremely vivid one, in which character types familiar in fiction appear in real life—the scandalmonger, the witch, the poacher, the dishonest bailiff—standing out from the large dim residuum of villagers who furnish the necessary background for a picture of the mediaeval rural scene.

A. J. RODERICK.

PSYCHO-ANALYSIS AND CATHOLIC THOUGHT

Psycho-Analytical Method and the Doctrine of Freud. By Roland Dalbiez. Translated from the French by T. F. Lindsay. (Longmans. 2 vols. 40s.).

The Successful Error. By Rudolf Allers. (Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.).

THE death of Freud is a fitting moment at which to survey the question of psycho-analysis in its relation to Catholic thought. He stands with Darwin and with Marx as one of the great figures of the nineteenth century who started mankind on one of its many spirals of thought and of self-evaluation.

It may be that psycho-analysis offers a greater challenge to Catholic belief about man than any other, for it seeks to explore and illuminate not only those "dark caverns of the mind" of which St. Augustine spoke, but reason itself, and the operation of the spirit.

To most Catholics it may have seemed that Freud was offering man a mirror in which he could not but see himself as Caliban—a creature at the mercy of his impulses, without freedom of choice, and but faintly illumined by the feeble rays of intellect; a creature no longer free to claim even the innocence of his childhood, since this, too, was filled with strange lusts and perversions of desire.

Yet it might have seemed to moral theologians that there was in this new exploration of man's passions something in effect like the charting of the ways of original sin, and that this new

science of the mind was worthy of close study. The approach, however, has been slow in coming.

In addition to a small Italian brochure written many years ago, and the attention given to it by Fr. Barbado, O.P., in his great work on experimental psychology, there was (to the reviewer's knowledge) only one other small but competent book entitled *Le Freudisme*, by Fr. de la Vaissiere, S.J. (besides articles in German, notably by R. Allers). In recent years, however, there has been a change; first Mortimer Adler, who is, though not a Catholic, a Thomist, wrote a remarkable series of notes under the title "What Man Has Made of Man". These were given as lectures to the Chicago Institute of Psycho-analysis; they consist of a striking approximation between Freudian concepts and those of the philosophia perennis, and a defence of psycho-analysis as a truly scientific method. Maritain, too, in his recent *Democracy and Politics*, devotes a chapter to psycho-analysis, mentioning Adler's work, but largely based on the important work by Dalbiez, which appeared in French several years before its belated but now timely and excellent translation.

Dalbiez, who is a professor of philosophy, started from the premise that philosophy alone is insufficient to solve the problems raised by psycho-analysis, and therefore spent several years in actual clinical study. As a result he concluded that it was necessary to distinguish a methodology, a psychology, and a philosophy in psycho-analysis, and the whole work is written largely with a view to distinguishing between the method or therapeutic technique and the "doctrine" which has grown up with it—finding it necessary to arraign much of the latter at the bar of philosophy.

The first volume is taken up with the exposition or setting forth of the Freudian method.

It starts, rightly, with the simplest of Freud's works, *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, in which he studied the real meaning behind the *lapsus linguae*, omissions, errors, in short the trivial circumstances of day-to-day existence ordinarily attributed to chance. Freud maintained that they are effects and signs of hidden affective urges. (Today he would have added what we know as "doodling", those little things that we all do "without thinking" and yet are so significant.) Through this approach we are led to the concepts of the Unconscious and of Repression—not *a priori* fabrications but the results of investigation by his incomparable technique of free association.

Then comes a chapter on Dreams: "The interpretation of dreams is the *via regia* to a knowledge of the unconscious element in our psychic life." Dreams were considered prophetic in

olden days; the Bible takes them seriously, no less than the Greeks, but their importance lapsed through the centuries and they were mentioned only in popular "dream-books". The scientific age studied them in a mechanistic fashion, as the effects of physical stimuli. It was left to Freud to restore them to their importance as psychic phenomena—opening a vista, however disguised, condensed and symbolized, into the depths of the mind.

Dalbiez does not consider that Freud's own book *The Interpretation of Dreams* is a satisfactory one, and he enlarges and illustrates the subject by examples from French writers and of his own patients.

He ends the chapter by distinguishing between knowledge and expression; the dream is a form of "psychic expression" or dereistic thought.

It would be impossible to summarize the ensuing chapters in this volume; they furnish a very useful and clear introduction to Sexual Theory, the Neuroses, Psychoses, Sublimation, and finally the structure of the psychic apparatus. They are the more valuable in so far as Freud's own theories are thrown into relief by quotations from his followers, and they are rich with illustrative cases.

It must be noted, however, that this exposition concerns the work of Freud and his disciples as it was at least ten years ago, and since then there have been considerable developments and modifications. Notably the study of "Aggression" has largely displaced the "Ego-Instincts", the "Censor" has pretty well disappeared, and the study of Super-Ego formation has greatly advanced. A more serious matter is the unsatisfactory treatment of the concept of the Unconscious. In the second volume, which is a criticism of the whole method and doctrine, the first chapter is labelled "The Unconscious". He fully realizes its importance for, as he says: "In defending the reality of the unconscious psychism, not only psycho-analysis, but psychology itself is fighting for its life", yet he is so taken up by his own views and with the philosophic implications of the subject, that he discusses Freud's own theories almost as an afterthought. Dalbiez states that the third chapter in this second volume, entitled "Methods of Exploring the Unconscious", is the most important in the whole work, and indeed, that for this alone the two volumes have been written. It concerns itself with the Association and Symbolic methods and with the conclusions to be drawn from them. The former method, he says, involves two results—de-repression and interpretation. "Normally the higher psychic functions control the lower. This control must be

momentarily interrupted in order to obtain the emergence of the lower psychism into the field of consciousness." The repressed material thus liberated can now be integrated or brought under conscious control with the help of the interpretation, which is the work of the analyst and patient together. The mistake is often made of supposing that the function of analysis is to effect a cognition of repressed material, but actually it is an active emotional process.

Symbolism, of course, is an important element in the psychic expression of the unconscious, and Dalbiez discusses the views of Freud on this matter, pointing out that confusion is caused by the use of the word "symbol" when in fact what is meant is a sign or symptom of a deeper process and not symbol in the full sense.

In concluding the chapter, Dalbiez states that in his opinion these methods correctly applied can lead us to certainty. To this he adds that personal research is an indispensable way of attaining conviction; had he himself not been brought face to face with the facts he would have remained sceptical. What then, he says, of those followers of Freud who have deserted his school? and in reply: "Not one of them was capable of making a sharp distinction between the method and the doctrine."

This is largely true of the Catholic psychologist *Rudolf Allers*, who does not admit the distinction between method and philosophy and delivers a thorough-going attack on Freud. He makes a great deal of the "materialism" inherent in psycho-analysis, but on this basis the whole of medical art and science, which has been based for many generations on a thoroughly materialist foundation, would stand condemned. At the same time he has to admit that it is Freud's "greatest and most unexpected achievement" to have "restored the knowledge of the leading role of the mind, the knowledge of the dominating place held by the soul in human nature" although "to do this was not his intention". It is a little difficult to see why the word "soul" is used here—is it the psyche of theology or psychology?

What the author refuses to admit is that, at least on the empirical plane, the findings and theories of psycho-analysis are at least in part *demonstrably* true, as evidenced by Dalbiez. An example of Allers' curious logistic way of attack is found in his discussion of the first of what he terms the "logical fallacies of psycho-analysis"; this is the concept of "resistance". In the process of free association there is often an interruption of the flow of ideas, and this usually heralds the subsequent production of painful or strongly affective memories and ideas; it would seem natural, therefore, to hold at least as a working hypothesis, that there *has* been "resistance", indeed the patient is often as aware as is the

analyst that this is so, but Allers will not have this, and we are merely allowed to observe that "no association occurs to the patient"; any explanation in terms of other "theories" (i.e. working hypotheses) of psycho-analysis being inadmissible. He ends this paragraph by making the statement that "it is better to have no theory at all than a wrong one"; how, one may ask, can one tell that a theory is wrong till it has been tried?

Dr. Allers does seem to forget that we are not dealing with logical but with dereistic thought. It is a great pity that Dr. Allers, who has done such good work in arousing the interest of Catholics in medical psychology, notably in his earlier work on the *Psychology of Character*, has been driven, by what appears to us a mistaken notion *ab initio*, to throw over psycho-analysis in such a wholesale manner. It is fortunate, therefore, that we have this work of Dalbiez as a corrective; the consideration of which we now resume.

As it is impossible to examine chapter by chapter the close and cogent presentation and criticism of Freudian views given by Dalbiez, we shall pass over the "Examination of Freudian Sexology" and refer particularly to a section of the next chapter, entitled "Morbid Psychic Causality". This is the third section on "Therapeutics of Psychic Disorders" and includes a point of view which must perforce be of very practical importance to the moral theologian.

It is often stated or implied by Catholics that the soul is the domain of the priest, and the body of the doctor, so that the psycho-analyst is on very dangerous ground indeed. It is also assumed that psycho-analysis being professedly determinist is destructive of "free-will", and that it makes no attempt at "synthesis". This is what Dalbiez says on the subject:

"The education of the will, owing to the *aim* which it inculcates, is the concern of morality or religion, but not of psychotherapy. The latter differs from moral or religious education not only in its *aim* but in its *means* as well. Whereas morality or religion use *liberty*, psychotherapy uses *determinism*. . . . The phenomena which psychotherapy sets out to modify are pathological phenomena, not moral faults. . . . We see therefore that, whereas morality aims at achieving man's whole and supreme good by means of the free will, psychotherapy aims at achieving a partial and relative human good—psychic or somatic health—by means of psychological determinism."

We reach the end of the book in a chapter entitled "Psycho-analysis and the Spiritual Life". It contains a very well-reasoned section on morality, showing very clearly that morality is not merely subjective or relative as the moderns believe and that

Freud's views on the origin of morality in the "primitive horde" are quite discredited. At the same time psycho-analysis performs the useful function of correcting an excessively moralistic or juridic estimate of men's transgressions. "Though man may be more reasonable than psychiatrists believe, he is less so than philosophers think." "We certainly do not dream of denying the specific and irreducible value of law and morality, but we cannot refrain from regretting how completely most of their exponents neglect the study of the findings of psycho-pathology. The result of this procedure is that the judgments they deliver often exhibit a shockingly unreal quality."

The last few quotations alone will indicate the great interest and value of this truly great work of criticism, for all intelligent Catholics; priests especially. The psycho-analysts themselves should be grateful for it—but they will not like it; they can seldom accept any criticism of their doctrine from outside (might one say that in this they resemble Catholics of a certain type?). Here at long last we have the beginnings, at least, of a solid bridge between the aged wisdom of the Church's philosophy of man, and (to quote the closing lines of the book) ". . . the most profound analysis that history has ever known of the less human elements in human nature" but, we may add, none the less important, for men are not angels.

If criticism were to be made of this work, it could not be made in detail; it is far too closely packed for that. It has a certain unwieldiness and over-luxuriance, giving the impression of being the growth of many years of arduous work and intense thought, sometimes almost thrown together. It could have done with pruning; there is too much from other psychologists, especially French; sometimes the author follows so much after his own thought that Freud seems forgotten.

One can only hope, however, that he will continue to follow the trail that he has so brilliantly begun; one could wish, too, that he might study, in the same manner, Jung's psychology which has become so increasingly pre-occupied with the religious side of man's nature. The most desirable event would be that he should present us with a much-shortened version of the present work—one that could be put into far more hands than it would ever be possible or prudent to put this one.

We are, however, very grateful to the author for what he has achieved for us, and can commend a study of his work with unreserved enthusiasm.

CHARLES BURNS.

SOME RECENT BOOKS

Rome and the Counter Reformation in England. By Philip Hughes. Pp. 446. (Burns Oates, 18s.).

FATHER HUGHES begins with the accession of Mary Tudor in 1553 and ends abruptly in 1632 with the close of Richard Smith's active episcopate. It is a crowded period, at once romantic and sordid, full of spectacular saints and spectacular sinners, of heroes and time-servers. It is even a period when an individual was capable of combining some or all of these qualities in his own person; so that we have the paradox of civil war among holy men, whose generosity was equal to the supreme test of martyrdom but not always to the duty of judging mild judgements.

The central and capital portion of this period, Elizabeth's reign, has been copiously written up, perhaps over-written. Yet there were gaps in our knowledge, even of this reign, notably the lives of Allen and Persons; and despite many stimulating suggestions in this new book, those gaps still remain. It is, rather, at the two extremes of this period that Father Hughes has made his most valuable contributions to our knowledge, with his study of the significance of Pole's Legation, and with the case for the defence of Bishop Smith, here printed for the first time from the Archives at Propaganda.

A general thesis runs through the book and is persuasively presented: that the failure of all attempts to regain England for Catholicism was chiefly Rome's own fault. In the first place, it was a fatal mistake to use political and spiritual weapons side by side against Elizabeth's settlement. Political action by the Papacy was out of date. The Reformation had already destroyed such unity in Christendom as was a necessary condition of success. And, therefore, political action was not only doomed to failure, but hampered the spiritual campaign of Allen's Missionary Priests by making them appear the agents of a foreign and hostile Power. When this was recognized at last and all thought of political action had been dropped, Rome made the further mistake of refusing to provide proper ecclesiastical organization in England. It was an extraordinary mistake, given Rome's passion for organization; it was doubly extraordinary in this case, seeing the succession of memorials which reached the Holy See. Rome was well-informed and made its decision with open eyes. Indeed, at the very beginning, the General of the Jesuits had given warning what the result must be: without episcopal jurisdiction, he said, it would be impossible for priests and religious to live together in one realm and escape all jars and discords. Nor is this food for scandal, even for wonderment. Times of persecution are also times of strained nerves,

as Church History plainly teaches from the Acts of the Apostles to our own day.

Father Hughes builds his thesis round four names, Pole, Allen, Persons and Richard Smith. Except in the case of the last, his work is based upon printed sources. Yet he contrives to say much that is new. Many readers will be startled by the verdict that "Allen was to the end of his days wholeheartedly pro-Spanish", while "Persons never goes this length" (p. 232). Yet the verdict is probably right. It is certainly true of Allen, and the coming C.R.S. edition of the letters of Persons should settle the question in his case. Again, Meyer printed much of the matter concerning Papal complicity in plots to assassinate Elizabeth, but it has remained for Father Hughes to consider all the evidence dispassionately and to place it in its political context. Perhaps this section would have been even clearer for a more succinct treatment—*plura verba claudicant*—but the difficulties of precise statement may be gathered from the baffling sentence (at the foot of p. 216) which tries to summarize the theory of tyrannicide. In this connection we must remark that there are not a few sentences throughout the book which need to be read more than once before they yield up their meaning.

The section on the Archpriest controversy is extremely valuable. Since Law's work in 1889, everyone has fought shy of this delicate subject. Father Hughes writes, not only with a fine regard for truth, but—what is rarer—with an equal regard for charity. And yet his presentation of the case for Bishop Smith, and therefore for the Seculars generally, is admittedly an *ex parte* statement. Apart from Cardinal Millini's memorandum, already printed in Tierney, nothing of equal authority is given from the side of the Regulars. The result, in spite of the author's disclaimers, must be an unduly definite picture in the reader's mind, which further evidence may not justify. Surely it would have been wiser to have published these important documents from Propaganda as an appendix, and not in the body of the work; as a vital contribution to the history of the Archpriest controversy, when that comes to be written, but emphasizing by its position in an appendix that it is only an element of the story, not the whole story.

There are some small inaccuracies, worth mentioning only for the sake of a second edition. The Guises (mentioned on p. 201) were cousins, not nephews, of Mary Queen of Scots. Persons went to Rome, not to Madrid, in 1583 (p. 203, top): while Crichton was neither at Paris nor Rome at this time, but at Chambéry (p. 202, last line). The statement of the relations between the *Ecclesia Anglicana* and the *Ecclesia Romana* (p. 12, last paragraph) is hard to reconcile with the history of the Anglo-Saxon Church. Father Hughes takes the traditional view of the famous mutiny in the English College that "the

fact of national antagonism between English and Welsh lay at the origin of these first disputes" (p. 179). Whereas the rebels' memorials (printed in *Dodd-Tierney*, Vol. II, p. cccxlviii, and C.R.S., Vol. II, p. 104) show that the origin was something quite different: (cf. *Venerabile*, IX, 417-426).

In the fine section on the Martyrs' loyalty to their country Father Hughes does not expressly meet Meyer's contention, that the least political of priests was a danger to the State because he was bound to be asked in the confessional about a Catholic's duty in the event of a Spanish invasion. Moreover, an even more telling list of loyal declarations by the Martyrs themselves could be compiled than those given on page 256 et seqq. But that of John Boste is magnificent (page 262).

These are very minor criticisms. There is no other up-to-date book which covers exactly the same ground. Its pages are liberally sprinkled with stimulating and illuminating judgements; it is worth while, for instance, to be reminded that Mary Tudor, "like all her family, had a first-rate intelligence". A fascinating, if tragic, story is told with unflinching grasp of the issues involved, and facts are never manipulated to clarify a theory. On the contrary, a clear thesis has emerged from wide reading of the available evidence. The pity is that all the evidence is not yet available. Its too-long-delayed production may qualify some of Father Hughes's conclusions; it is unlikely to upset them altogether.

RICHARD L. SMITH.

Masters of Political Thought. Edited by E. M. Sait. Volume I: Plato to Machiavelli. By Michael B. Foster, M.A. (Oxon), Ph.D. (Kiel). (Harrap & Co. Pp. 294. 10s. 6d.)

EVERYONE whose duty it has been to teach the history of political ideas, or indeed of philosophy in general, has learned by experience the double difficulty of holding the interest of his hearers and of being (necessarily) brief but accurate, sympathetic but critical. Brevity is no friend to nuances and qualifications of thought, and may result in involuntary misrepresentation. To omit criticism is to fail in one's task, but the effort to be sympathetic to a system tends to blind the critical eye. Attention, too, whether of hearers or readers, tends to flag when faced with a highly compressed digest of abstract ideas. The lot of the student who has to rely solely on books about other people's books is even harder than that of one who has at least a modicum of help from a teacher. What he reads is only too often, as the American editor of this series rightly says, a summary of summaries, for he can rarely afford the time (even if he has the opportunity) to work through the sources themselves. To meet this difficulty, an interesting plan has been adopted in this series. Copious quotations from the more famous political thinkers re

linked together by a running commentary. The success or failure of this plan obviously depends upon the choice of quotations and the quality of the commentary. Dr. Foster has been entrusted with the treatment of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, and Machiavelli, and more than half his volume is devoted to the first two. For the most part, the passages he quotes from his authors are apt, and long enough to be both interesting and illustrative, without being too long; and his commentary will prove very useful to the student. He does not confine himself to explaining his texts; he raises issues which stimulate the reader to think for himself. For instance, at the close of his chapter on St. Augustine, he points out that the secularism of modern "democratic" theory dangerously weakens "democracy" in its opposition to totalitarianism. Before what Court of Appeal can the State be cited if not before some authority claiming to speak in the name of God? When the western world has exhausted the "Christian capital" on which it has been living it will be confronted with a twofold question: Can the individual bear the responsibility of a private judgement destitute of guidance by any authority higher than itself? Can the State be excluded permanently from encroaching on a sphere which is filled by nothing else? One must be grateful to Dr. Foster for putting the issue so clearly before his readers, many of whom are likely to be startled by such a home-thrust in a history of political thought. With his treatment of St. Thomas one cannot be so satisfied. Having given so much space to the Greeks, he is inevitably cramped when he comes to Aquinas, and he limits himself almost exclusively to the Thomist doctrine of law (eternal, natural, positive). He fails to mention St. Thomas's views about a "mixed constitution" (1a 2ae. qu. 105, art. 1), and to discuss his attitude to the mediaeval theory of the original sovereignty of the people. The important passage which should have formed part of this discussion (1a 2ae. qu. 90, art. 3) is merely used, in a long footnote, for an attempt to prove an inconsistency in St. Thomas on another point, an attempt which overlooks the solution given in qu. 97, art. 3, ad. 1. One long quotation from *De Regimine Principum* is given, but it gives little idea of the political shrewdness of that opusculum. The bibliography to this chapter is quite inadequate; for instance, it makes no mention of Zeiller's *L'Idée de l'Etat dans S. Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris, 1910).

LEWIS WATT, S.J.

Mediaeval Libraries of Great Britain—A List of Surviving Books. Edited by N. R. Ker. (Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks No. 3. Offices of the Royal Historical Society, London, 1941.)

A KNOWLEDGE of the contents of mediaeval libraries is of great value to mediaeval studies. It is possible to gauge from it not only the

cultural level of a determinate place or institution during some period in the Middle Ages, but also to perceive intellectual influences and connexions. A definitive history of classical scholarship in mediaeval Europe is yet to be attempted. When such a huge and invaluable task is undertaken one of its most important materials will be provided by information on the location of classical texts in monastic and academic libraries, such a location furnishing a fairly safe barometer of the intellectual climate at a definite time.

Because of its great importance to the historian of mediaeval culture, both the editor and the Royal Historical Society must be warmly congratulated for the publication of this most valuable handbook. As its title shows, it consists of a list of extant books which were to be found in British libraries during the Middle Ages. The list is as neat, completion as possible. It is the collective work of several scholars, and is the result of much painstaking search through the manuscript collections of British and many continental libraries. The contents of American libraries have also been carefully sifted and one of the listed manuscripts is now in the Imperial University Library of Tokyo, to which it was presented by the late Canon Streeter as a friendly gesture after the great earthquake in the nineteen-twenties.

The value of this book as a work of reference is furthermore increased by what is virtually a bibliography of British mediaeval library catalogues, both printed and in manuscript. The usefulness of such a bibliography is too obvious to need explanation. It forms an invaluable supplement to the lists in Becker, Gottlieb, and Edwards, and makes one hope that once conditions are again normal the publication of a collected edition of all extant British mediaeval library catalogues on the lines of that by Lehmann for Germany, Austria, and Switzerland will be possible.

A concise introduction shows the very rigid and scholarly standards followed in the compilation of this list. So far as I am concerned, I can only suggest a few trifling *addenda*: On p. 86 one should add that a fifteenth-sixteenth-century catalogue of All Souls' College Library is in the half-burnt "vellum inventory" now preserved in the college archives. On p. 81 add that a sixteenth-century list of Lincoln College Library, also still unpublished, is to be found in the *Registrum Vetus* of Lincoln College, Oxford. On p. 103, l. 51, for *Bergamensis* read *Bergomensis*. An early-fifteenth-century book of hours owned by the Cluniac Priory of St. Milburga, Wenlock, during the first half of the sixteenth century, was included as item No. 89 in *Catalogue No. 27* of G. Michelmores & Co., London, 1938.

R. WEISS.

The Cambridge History of the British Empire: Vol. II. (Cambridge University Press. 50s.).

THIS volume covers the period 1783-1870. It is the story of the Empire as it was administered or acquired under the influence of a philosophy increasingly opposed to imperialism. The American Colonies had been lost under circumstances which reinforced for the younger Pitt the general teachings of his master, Adam Smith. In general, Pitt wanted to pursue an enlightened policy in the spirit of his father's great utterance, that the hearts and good affections of the people of Bengal were worth more than all the profits of ruinous and odious monopolies. But he also desired little state action, and the generations succeeding him desired less, and the generation of the first half of Victoria's reign less again. It was the private man who was passively encouraged, and in tropical Africa the economic conditions were not suited to anyone else. In the West African slave trade, for example, all the advantages lay with the small private venture. There was no organized supply of negroes, but a supply depending upon the caprice of native chiefs. The big industrial unit, which has the advantage when both market and source of supply can be organized, had no advantage under these primitive conditions. When control by government was established it was generally very reluctantly done by statesmen who hated the responsibility and the expense, and were moved to action mainly by fear that the French would step in if Britain did not.

Imperial government, carried on under the belief that it would be best for everybody if it did not exist, is a history of the grant of responsible government wherever possible, without reserving any rights of emigration for the people of the mother country or any rights in the mineral or other wealth of the huge territories thus handed over to the small populations who had settled there without expecting such immense windfalls. The problems of the next period, problems of imperial unity, date from the reign of *laissez-faire* in the period treated here.

Religion suffered as the triumph of liberal ideas at home made the Government adopt a more and more neutral attitude to religion in the Empire. Thus the Church of England finally failed in the 1830's to be accepted as having a special prerogative, and what grants the Government made, it made to all the chief religious bodies. When the Test Act and the Corporation Act were repealed at home, as they were in 1828, it became difficult for the Church of England to claim special treatment in the Colonies. Where there was strong Catholic population, as in Quebec, the Government treated the Catholic Church well, and the Quebec Act was the model elsewhere, but the Government did not consider it had any evangelizing mission in places where the people had still to be converted to Christianity. That, like trade,

was left to private enterprise, and the traders did not welcome the missionaries. In retrospect this looks an extraordinary policy for a Christian country. No oleograph was more popular in Victorian England than that of the kneeling negro being given a Bible by Queen Victoria as the secret of her greatness, but in fact the Queen in this period left the Bible-giving mainly to her subjects, and did very little through her ministers. Thus the Government grant to the S.P.G., which began in a small way at £1800 in 1814, and rose rapidly in the next few years, was diminished again through the later '20's and '30's, and when the Queen came to the throne she found Lord Melbourne and his ministers increasingly indisposed to the notion of all such grants.

This period, when statesmen indulged in a self-denying ordinance and private enterprise flourished, presents in consequence much that is exciting and stirring in the exploits of private persons, and much in decision and folly in Whitehall. Both stories are well and fully told and documented in the twenty-three chapters of this collective history. Inevitably it tends to be mainly a crowded chronological record, with too little interpretation and analysis. One reason for this is the compression imposed on the authors. Another is the great number of different authors, and it is difficult not to feel that the subdivision between competent pens is carried rather too far. In a thousand pages only five of the authors write twice, and the volume suffers by each chapter being so closely confined to its special subject matter, so that the main lines of the period never emerge as decisively as they should. But the book remains, as Cambridge histories do, indispensable, at once a great storehouse of little-known facts, and a well-prepared guide to more detailed reading.

DOUGLAS WOODRUFF.

Canada: America's Problem. By John MacCormac. (Jonathan Cape, 1941. Pp. 250. 10s. 6d.).

JOHN MACCORMAC, who is a well-known correspondent for the *New York Times*, has written what is probably the best available brief review of Canadian-American relations and current problems. Certainly it is one of the most interesting and provocative books of its kind.

The author's purpose is "to describe Canada, to estimate her vast potentialities, to measure her not inconsiderate development of them, and to indicate the highly complicated character of her population, her politics and her economics". Of course, in 250 pages even a newspaper correspondent could hardly do justice to such an ambitious programme as this, but Mr. MacCormac makes a good effort, marred only now and then by some needless repetition. However, to non-

Canadian readers probably the most interesting aspect of the book is the author's discussion of Canadian-American relations as they are affected by Canada's position as a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. (The book, incidentally, was written before the United States became a belligerent, and much of Mr. MacCormac's speculation is based on the question whether the United States can remain neutral while Canada is a belligerent.) Canada, he says, makes isolation impossible for the United States; while she remains within the British Empire she compromises American neutrality. On the other hand, he claims, Canada makes imperialism impossible for Great Britain. Because she is an American nation, tied to the United States by ever-stronger links, she challenges British involvement in Europe.

These statements are obviously rather too sweeping. We know now that the United States was forced to enter the present war not because of her close ties with Canada or even with Great Britain. We hope, too, that the people of the United States have now at last realized that their neutrality in any important international conflict is impossible; in other words, that the close inter-relationship of all nations, not only of the United States and Canada, has made neutrality impossible to maintain. The significance of Mr. MacCormac's statements referred to, and his subsequent development of them, is this: that Canada has become the most important link between the British and American peoples. As he says, "There is no conceivable rôle she [Canada] could play, in this day and age, so useful to the world as that of catalyst in the achievement of an English-speaking union."

It will perhaps be a surprise to many readers to learn that in the 157 years of their separate existence Canada has twice been invaded by the United States and within the last seventy years the territory of each has been used as a base for guerilla attacks on the other. The peoples of the two countries, as Mr. MacCormac points out, have such different backgrounds and cultures that they have only in very recent years begun to understand each other. Fortunately they both have short memories—old feuds and misunderstandings are forgotten in the present era of good-neighbourliness, and will remain so.

Space does not permit more than mere mention of some other interesting topics in this book: the problem of the French-Canadian minority; the policies of Mr. Mackenzie King; the problems of Canadian participation in the affairs of the British Commonwealth; and many others. This is a book to be read with pleasure and profit.

JAMES H. LEWIS.

How Strong is America? By Noel Barber. (Harrap, 6s. net.)

A Brief History of the United States. By Allan Nevins. (Oxford University Press, 3s. 6d. net.)

The British Commonwealth and the United States in the Post-War World. (Peace Aims Pamphlet, No. 10, 1s.)

ALL of these three books are valuable, yet on each there is a limitation to its value for which the authors are not at all to blame. Mr. Nevins' book is a short and simple history of the United States suitable for school-children. It was recently discovered that no such book existed in this country, and the American Ambassador therefore prevailed upon Mr. Nevins, then the Harmsworth Professor of American History at Oxford University, to supply the need. This is indeed a praiseworthy task, for, whatever our precise views either upon the present or the future of the United States, yet at least we cannot quarrel with the moderate judgement that it is and will remain for some time to come an important country, and the neglect of its history in English education is indeed an extraordinary and shameful phenomenon. We are often accused of being excessively insular in our education. But here the fault runs even deeper than that. With some difficulty it has recently been possible to persuade the academics that foreigners have had some history. And there is now no paradox in including a paper on European history alongside that upon English history. The history of the Empire is also admitted to have existed. But who ever heard of anyone studying American history at school? And indeed, how many grown Englishmen know anything about it? The only doubt is whether it is possible to make the story intelligible in so very short a compass as Mr. Nevins allows himself.

Mr. Barber's book on *How Strong is America?* is a factual record of her resources and of her productive statistics. There are also some admirable incidental pen-pictures of leading American personalities. It is written in an objective, critical and encouraging spirit. Its only misfortune is that it was written before the United States came into the war and that therefore some parts of it are necessarily already out of date. They are out of date in two ways. In the first way, actual belligerency has enabled the Administration to concentrate on war-production with a single-mindedness which was impossible in the days of peace and peace-time mentality. Mr. Barber in his book recognized that this would be so, and it is to be hoped that the effect of it will be that some of the estimates of future production which he has given will be exceeded. The other result is unfortunately a less happy one. The reason why most of the prophecies of the economists have gone wrong in this war is not that the calculations have in themselves been at fault. The reason is rather that the areas from which the calculations have been drawn have changed with the changing fortunes of war, and from this

point of view the pages in which Mr. Barber demonstrates the strength of America's raw material position but at the same time her dependence upon Dutch and Malayan rubber make most obviously sad reading.

The whole pattern of the world is changing so rapidly from day to day that it is doubtful how much purpose is served by the drawing up of detailed plans for the ordering of the post-war world. We have first to win the war, and then we must see what sort of a world it is that we have to order. For instance, though none dispute the importance of preserving throughout all future ages the closest Anglo-American friendship, yet it is hardly possible to decide the details of our relationship until the Americans make up their minds how large a part they are willing to play in the ordering of post-war Europe. That they have by no means as yet done, and at this stage probably the most important service is to teach the English people as much as possible about the facts of America. The time for programmes will come later. From that point of view the two first books on this list are a great deal more valuable than the Peace Aims Pamphlet, and indeed it is not hypercritical to suggest that some of the writers in the pamphlet would have done better had they first put themselves to school to learn what America is from such books as those of Mr. Barber and Mr. Nevins before they started to discuss her policy and our policy towards her. For instance, when Miss Vera Brittain says of Lord Lothian that "I think I am right in saying that he is the only ambassador who has ever been intimately acquainted with both the British Commonwealth and the United States", one cannot help wondering at the qualifications for such judgements of one who does not seem to be acquainted with the work of Lord Bryce.

CHRISTOPHER HOLLIS.

The Diffusion of English Culture. By H. V. Routh. (Cambridge. 3s. 6d.)

If you send a young man from Oxford or Cambridge to teach English in Kovus, he will probably take to drink. I can believe it. I should. But it is just as well to remind ourselves that foreigners are not interested in English culture. They want, in applying for a post, to be able to enclose his Cambridge Certificate of Proficiency, and to "assure you that I am wholly competent to cover any assignment which you may be wilful to confide me at". If you expect more of them, you will be disappointed.

So, having set his ladder well and firmly on the ground, Mr. Routh climbs cautiously upward. Whatever their motives, these foreigners do want to learn English. When the Institute was opened in Athens, special police arrangements had to be made to regulate the crowd of applicants. So they had better learn it properly, and the teaching of

languages has now become a highly refined science. Therefore the teachers must be taught—selected young, and put through a course of professional training in linguistics before they are let loose on Cairo and Pernambuco. But who is to select them, train them: post them, shift them; dismiss, promote, and generally see that they are diffusing English culture, and not getting across the Embassy or his Colony or his Natives, or acquiring a too decided taste for slivovitz or ouzo? This is the problem, set out by Mr. Routh with a slightly acidulated appreciation of its difficulties—the chief of them being the difficulty of keeping an English mind alive in exile, and in a position of no great distinction or authority. On the face of it, you will not easily persuade a man who is good enough for Uppingham or Oundle to go and teach Basic English in Dorpat or Koloszar.

αἰάξω Διόπρον, ὃς ἐν πέτραισι καθίζει,
Γαργαρέων παισὶν Β καὶ Α λέγων.

But if he is not good enough, he ought not to go. From this dilemma there is no real or obvious issue. But the best way of dodging it is probably to make the central government of this new Foreign Service a really distinguished affair—administratively competent so that the business of placing and pensioning and the rest would be conducted with as few mistakes and grievances as possible: intellectually eminent, so that Diotimus in his moodiest hour might feel that he was after all a member of an important and world-famous body: that someone had a kindly eye on him, was studying his reports or researches with attention, and was following with approval his efforts to understand the Natives without getting across the Colony or the Embassy. This is Mr. Routh's solution. I think he is right, and I hope his suggestions will receive the attention they deserve from those who will have the settling of these matters after the war.

G. M. YOUNG.

A Short History of Modern Greece. By Edward S. Forster. (Methuen. 12s. 6d.)

THIS book has such considerable merits (presently to be particularized) that it may seem ungracious to begin a review of it by warning the reader of possible disappointments. Yet it must be said that those who turn to a book on the subject of modern Greece are likely to want elucidations that go considerably beyond anything that this book provides. For not only are most people very ignorant about contemporary Greece, but even the better-informed find much in her recent political history to perplex and distress them. And there are still some among us old-fashioned enough to be interested in the old question of how far modern Greece represents, or misrepresents,

the Greece of antiquity. From any of these points of view Mr. Forster's book must be judged to be both ill-proportioned and lacking in background.

The lack of proportion between its parts may be measured by the fact that, of the three approximately equal sections into which it is divided, the first deals with the ninety-three years from the outbreak of the War of Independence to 1914 (or, if the introductory chapter is included, with the four centuries from the Turkish conquest); the second deals with the four years from Sarajevo to the Armistice; and the third with the twenty-two years from the Armistice to the Italian attack on Greece. This distribution of space is fairly obviously the result of the possession of undoubtedly valuable first-hand knowledge of the war period, gained by the author as British representative at the French G.H.Q. at Salonika, but it scarcely contributes to the perspective to be expected of a "history". It has the further disadvantage of giving the fullest treatment to the period most fully covered by recent memoirs.

In the second place, the historical narrative lacks a background. There is no picture of the economic, social and cultural or even of the political life of Greece against which to set the bare summary of political events of which the greater part of the book necessarily consists. The few paragraphs devoted to these topics in a final chapter are by no means adequate to fill this gap; quite apart from their position at the end of the book.

The gap is all the more conspicuous because even the narrative of political events is concerned predominantly with external affairs. The character of political life in modern Greece, the working of the parliamentary system there, the nature of the forces by which it was manipulated and corrupted—on all these matters the author is silent except for an occasional and belated allusion. There is only one reference to the "spoils system", and it is not made until it has to explain the absence of something that the system "had long prevented". Certain "flagrant abuses" are mentioned only when they are supposed to have been "swept away". An utterly incompetent Prime Minister is described as a man who would never have become Prime Minister under normal conditions "even in Greece", and this is the first reference to the incompetence of Prime Ministers, although the office had been in existence in Greece for more than seventy years before the advent of the incompetent in question.

Thus the reader is given no help towards elucidating a phenomenon very disconcerting to the friends of modern Greece. Nor is he assisted in relating Modern Greece to ancient. Mr. Forster does indeed touch (in the last chapter) upon this question in its racial aspect, but he neither makes the political comparison with ancient Greece himself nor gives the reader the material for making it—an

omission all the more surprising since he is himself a teacher of the classics.

However, an author has always the right to reply to complaints of omissions by pointing out that his plan excluded the topics in question: and so long as the reader understands what to expect, no harm is suffered. Certainly, what the author does undertake is done very well indeed. The narrative is direct and clear and written, with rare lapses, in refreshingly simple and direct English. As a bare narrative of the political history and, particularly, the external relations of modern Greece (so bare as almost to suggest at times the *Annual Register*) it could hardly be bettered, provided, at least, that the reader is prepared to accept an almost unwavering championship of Venizelos, whose highly controversial activities necessarily fill many pages.

In this championship the author is, of course, well within his rights and may, quite possibly, be in the right as well. In spite of himself, however, Mr. Forster throws some ugly sidelights on the last years of the eight times Premier, as when reference is made to arrests by his "private police force" (not previously mentioned), or when his absence on a certain occasion is suggested as the explanation of the peaceful political atmosphere then prevailing. His resort at the last to armed insurrection is unequivocally condemned by Mr. Forster, and the dictatorship of General Metaxas is treated with a fairness highly creditable in a convinced Venizelist.

F. R. HOARE.

Great Britain and China. By Sir John Pratt. (No. 58, Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs.)

Japan and the Modern World. By Sir John Pratt. (No. 55, Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs.) (Oxford University Press. Each price 4d.)

THESE two pamphlets are complementary to each other and are intended as a short guide through the maze of Far Eastern politics; but, while Japan is faithfully and forcibly dealt with, the author has not done so well with China and, indeed, his essay is almost bound to annoy any Chinese who reads it.

Sir John Pratt has acquired his knowledge of the Far East from a long career in the Consular Service in China, so that he views the situation there, and the part Britain played in creating it, through the rosy lorgnettes of the Foreign Office. For example, Chinese resentment of extra-territoriality and other privileges enjoyed by foreign merchants in China was, he argued, merely a case of Chinese perversity in that China first granted these privileges by way of showing contempt for the white barbarian whose conduct she could not

bother to supervise, and only became resentful when they were enforced by Treaty after the war of 1839-1842. Nevertheless, Sir John says kindly, China was doing very well for herself, with British help, until Japan came along and—chiefly to spite Britain, it would seem—struck her down. Japan, for her part, is unreasonably touchy over things like racial discrimination and the imposition of tariffs, attaching “inordinate importance to matters of pure sentiment which cause no material injury”: a remark that, surely, you would expect to find in *Simplicissimus*, under a suitable drawing.

To those who look on Britannia as the old family governess, who patiently tries to keep her tiresome little charges amused, much that is happening in the world today must seem like the basest ingratitude. This is evidently Sir John's own view, and it is all the more curious because he has a great deal of understanding and admiration for Chinese civilization, and for the Asiatic mind in general: he is a Blimp of a fascinating sort, shrewd, cultured and humorous: his literary power alone makes the two essays worth reading.

HONOR WINGFIELD.

China Through Catholic Eyes. By Thomas F. Ryan, S.J. Preface by Mme Chiang Kai-shek. (C.T.S., Hong Kong.)

CATHOLIC missions have usually surpassed others in their understanding of native culture and genius. To see excellence in the heathen, to admire him and enjoy his works, and to state a universal truth in a peculiar idiom, comes easily to men imbued with the philosophy that the human race is one. This has been particularly true in China from the earliest times, as Father Ryan shows in this book. Father Ricci, who went to China in 1582, studied the language and classics of the country for many years, and became the friend of eminent scholars, before he even ventured to speak to the Chinese of the Faith: and his example was followed by the long line of Jesuits who came after and who were often the friends and valued counsellors of the Emperor: indeed, it may be said that these Fathers entered into the Chinese spirit to the extent of calling first on the wise and the learned, and then on the humble and meek.

The fruits of this tender appreciation are seen now. China is torn in pieces but the Chinese peasant still brings a few cents to help rebuild the Catholic church or the hospital: now when the Japanese would like the Occident to be disliked and despised, and when many a Protestant harmonium has shut for the last time, the Catholic missions continue their work, adding new martyrs to the already splendid list and finding new rewards. Nor will China have forgotten that when she stood alone in 1928, waiting for an encouraging voice from the outside world, only the Vatican spoke.

Father Ryan writes of the struggles of the young Republic, of China's past history and present endeavour, of the Church's educational work with profound knowledge and admirable simplicity. In his treatment of Chinese Communism, however, it must be said that he is less happy: a movement which is playing a considerable part in China's struggle for freedom should not be passed over in a few contemptuous phrases. Father Ryan seems not to know that in nine cases out of ten, "guerilla" is simply another term for "Partisan", or Party member. Apart from this one criticism the book is recommended as an excellent Chinese study. The illustrations are chosen with intelligence, and there is a foreword by the wife of the Generalissimo.

HONOR WINGFIELD.

A Christian Basis for the Post-War World: a Commentary on the Ten Peace Points. Edited by A. E. Baker. (Student Christian Movement Press, 2s. 6d.)

THE publication of a letter in *The Times* of December 21, 1940, signed by the two Anglican Archbishops, the Roman Catholic Cardinal and the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council, was for two reasons a notable event; in the first place, never before had the official heads of the Christian communities together addressed the nation on a religious issue, and in the second, they offered what may be deemed an agreed Christian Peace Policy.

But a policy is not a plan. It was plain to any attentive reader that the Ten Peace Points of the letter were revolutionary in the sense that they pointed to a post-war world vastly different from the order we have known hitherto. But general principles need elucidation and may be open to very different interpretations. The book before us, written by eleven distinguished persons of different communions, offers a commentary on the Ten Points. This commentary is neither homogeneous nor authoritative, but it should admirably serve its purpose of provoking discussion and further reflection.

The essays are not fully homogeneous. Thus, Mr. R. R. Stokes seems to point to international Free Trade, while Canon Baker (whose "epilogue" was presumably written because Miss Margaret Bondfield achieved no more than three pages upon her important subject) insists that, in the interests of agriculture, tariffs cannot be abolished. Again, Mr. Kenneth Ingram thinks that the Soviet Union rather than the British Empire offers the best model for the establishment of international harmony, while Mr. Sidney Dark looks for a Teutonic Confederation, a Slav Confederation and other similar units. There are many divergences of this kind, but each of the essays deserves careful consideration and criticism, and there seems general agreement

between the writers that some sort of international police-force will be necessary, that a planned economic system, both national and international, must supplant the chaotic competitive and nationalistic policies of the past, and that, as the Master of Balliol eloquently pleads, our system of national education must be radically transformed.

The essays are not authoritative and do not fully bear out the title of the book. Each of the writers has sketched his personal ideas of the proper application of one of the Ten Points, but there is little exposition of the Christian basis of the policy as a whole. On practical expedients Christians are not wiser than other men. Of these writers only Miss Barbara Ward and Miss Dorothy Sayers have in any serious way pointed to the theological and religious basis of the Ten Points.

In spite of the paper shortage a spate of books by Christians about the post-war world is issuing from the press. Amongst them this little book is of high value, but it is much to be hoped that, to fulfil the promise of its title, this commentary may be followed by another volume of a more theological and philosophical kind to expound the principles upon which the common Christian policy of these Ten Points must rest.

NATHANIEL MICKLEM.

Christianity and Social Order. By Dr. Temple. (Penguin. 6d.)

THE news of Dr. Temple's translation from York to Canterbury coincided with the appearance of his long-awaited Penguin Special on *Christianity and Social Order*. The burning question of what Christianity had to say upon the practical problems of life today had already been taken up in two Penguins devoted to the international field: the Bishop of Chichester's *Christianity and World Order*, and A. C. F. Beales's *Catholic Church and International Order*. Dr. Temple's book is concerned with the domestic side of social and economic reform—a theme on which public interest is concentrating more deeply every day.

There will be little here for the critic who looks to the Churches for cut-and-dried, tabloid answers on the detailed questions of social happiness. The Archbishop, indeed, is emphatic in setting out the limits beyond which a churchman, speaking *qua churchman*, ought not to go, while insisting on the wide duty of the Christian *qua citizen* to influence policy along the lines he knows to be sound in principle.

"We answer the question 'How should the Church interfere?' by saying: In three ways (1) Its members must fulfil their moral responsibilities and functions in a Christian spirit; (2) its members must exercise their purely civic rights in a Christian spirit; (3) it must itself supply them with a systematic statement of principles to aid them in doing these two things, and this will carry with it a denunciation of

customs or institutions in contemporary life and practice which offend against those principles."

The book itself is a bold and scrupulous example of what that quotation involves. It analyses, first, the justification and the field of "Christian interference" in politics, illustrated from classic examples in past history that have been both sound and successful. It then sets out, in two highly condensed chapters, the primary and derivative principles that lie beneath the social teaching of Christianity: the purpose of God, the dignity of Man, and the derivative concepts of Freedom, Social Fellowship, and Service. Perhaps the most beneficial section of this survey for our own generation will be that in which the "natural order" is explained in relation to its supernatural setting—with concrete examples of what the philosophy of the Natural Law means when used to answer the practical questions of industry, such as why goods ought to be produced at all, and how the consumer's interests can be squared with the making of profits. And at the end:

"Freedom is a finer thing than order, but order is more indispensable than freedom. . . . The conservative temperament tends to dwell on what is indispensable, that this may be safeguarded. The radical temperament tends to dwell most on the higher ends of life, that these may be facilitated. The world needs both. But wisdom consists in the union of the two. The great advantage of the conception of Natural Law is that it leads us to consider every activity in its context of the *whole* economy of life. . . ."

Dr. Temple then abandons the rostrum. Speaking no further as an ecclesiastic expounding principles, he comes down into the arena and gives us an Appendix in which, speaking as citizen and with such expert knowledge as his public life has afforded him, he makes a personal contribution to help those who like to see an argument translated into a programme. He works out the implications of the Ten Points in the now famous *Times* letter (of Dec. 21, 1940, signed by all the Christian leaders of the country), stressing especially the lines of reform he wishes to see followed in questions touching the family, education, incomes, the conduct of business and industry, leisure, and human freedom. The expert knowledge and the deep reflection here revealed are prodigious.

But all this has to be read in terms of the author's carefully repeated warning: "This book is about Christianity and the social order, not about Evangelism. But I should give a false impression of my own convictions if I did not here add that there is no hope of establishing a more Christian social order except through the labour and sacrifice of those in whom the Spirit of Christ is active, and that the first necessity of progress is more and better Christians taking full responsibility as citizens for the political, social and economic system under which they and their fellows live."

B.

The Moral Blitz. By Bernard Causton. (Searchlight Books. Secker & Warburg. 2s.)

THIS is an important book, despite its catchpenny title, and despite the fact that the author sets out to cover too much ground, and consequently tends to lose the thread of his discourse. The scope of the book is best indicated by the sub-title "War Propaganda and Christianity", and it is important because it brings together the two greatest problems with which England is faced concurrently with her armed combat with Nazism—her own social reform, and the new European order. The author writes with a knowledge of Germany during the inflation years and again from 1933-1939 when he was a Berlin newspaper correspondent. To review adequately his account of the relations between the German Churches and the Nazi regime would seem to require a very detailed knowledge of events and tendencies since 1919, but Mr. Causton definitely attempts to present an impartial view of the question from which to draw his own conclusions.

How far is England justified in posing as the champion of Christian civilization against paganism? We protest against the Nazi persecution of the Churches, in a vague hope that we can thus undermine German morale by playing upon conflicting loyalties, but forgetting that even Germans who are not Nazis want to win the war and that "Niemöller went to concentration camp for his Faith, not for love of the British Empire". In the propaganda war Germany can reply with criticisms of our social system, in which it is often difficult to find a true basis of Christian principles. But there is this difference—that criticisms of Nazi sins of commission are a reflection upon their New Order, while criticisms of our sins of omission should be welcome, since our New Order is yet to come.

If we can set our house in order—and Malvern revealed a large section of the Church of England reasserting the social aspect of Christianity—other peoples would be more ready to listen to our loudly proclaimed defence of Christianity. It is not enough to denounce the Nazi perversion of values; it is not enough to pass resolutions (and the Malvern resolutions do not find unanimous support in the Church of England), but the formation of a Christian public opinion, as Mr. Causton points out, is the first step towards effecting social change in a democracy. There will be opposition to the Church's "interference", but it is the Church's function today to exert its moral influence on the building of a social order in which a Christian life is possible for the majority: Christ was both God and man, and His Church is necessarily concerned with this world as well as the world to come—hence the present need for continual interaction between sociology and theology.

We cannot solve the German problem till we have solved our own—that is the thesis of *The Moral Blitz*. Concrete evidence that England recognizes the implications of her claims to be the champion of Christendom can alone win support for us in Europe after the war. We cannot again lightly abandon our moral responsibilities to a defeated Germany. To argue whether we are to use our power as a deterrent or an inducement is to split democratic opinion and to play into the hands of Axis propaganda. But our hope for the future lies in the belief that we can use our power justly, to maintain peace in Europe, and mercifully to develop and use the great qualities of the German people. But it must be by her example rather than by her precept that England must convince Europe of her sincerity.

ROBIN ATTHILL.

New England: Indian Summer, 1865-1915. By Van Wyck Brooks. (Dent. 18s.)

To all but a very few amongst us, much of this book is bound to be strange country. Addressing himself to Americans, and to well-read Americans at that, the author naturally takes for granted a knowledge of books, persons, history and social climates which lies outside the sedate limits of any education customary in England. It is one thing to have read some Hawthorne, Emerson, and Henry and William James; it is another to feel at home with the novels of W. D. Howells and the miscellaneous works of the Adams family. The present reviewer, having no acquaintance beyond the most common with American things generally, can offer only some first impressions of a book which he cannot claim to assess.

As a literary critic in the strict sense, Mr. Brooks makes little impact; for example, he seems to regard *Evangeline* and *Hiawatha* with too childlike an eye. But in interpreting movements and tendencies, in evoking the inner feeling of a period or a region, he is interesting and acute—so with the few telling lines on Poe's Helen and her background, the chapter on "Aesthetic Boston", and the somewhat grisly picture of degenerate rural life as disclosed by Mary Wilkins. Two quotations will show something of his qualities. Both concern Boston in the 'nineties.

"The moment was appropriate for the founding of the Ingersoll Lectures on Immortality, 1897. Few indeed believed any longer in immortality, but there was a general interest in hearing what could be said for it."

And again:

"Literature became merely literary. . . . It was driven to follow models more abjectly than ever, and models that were also arbitrary,"

unlike the co-ordinated models of the earlier writers who had borne an organic relation to the men they followed."

But Mr. Brooks' most notable gift is his ability on occasion to descry vital correspondences between literary phenomena and the world outside literature, for instance, between realistic fiction and contemporary science, the descriptions of a Balzac and the growing belief in the power of material environment. A more subtle example in a similar vein is the connection of country life and classical studies in the older writers, the connection of urban life and the new books among their juniors.

"The prestige of the country had passed, as the balance of power had also passed from agriculture to industry and business, and the younger men no longer read the Greek and Roman authors. . . . They read, along with works of science, the new French novelists and playwrights, who pictured city life as the only life for ambitious men and described the life of the province as dull and silly. This change in reading habits was decisive; for while those who had known their Plutarch and Virgil had grown up to spacious lives in villages, in hamlets and on farms, as the older statesmen and writers abundantly proved, the young men, steeped in modern books, were almost all uprooted before they read them. This reading confirmed their habits as *déracinés*."

Here what appeared as merely proximity is shown as something nearer to symbiosis. The technique is that of Lewis Mumford, to whom the book is not inappropriately dedicated.

WALTER SHEWRING.
Selected Poems. By Robert Bridges. (Faber and Faber, 2s. 6d.).

THIS little book is one of a series which the publishers have designed to serve as introductions to the work of various modern poets. It contains some thirty of Robert Bridges' lyrics, a complete episode from *Eros and Psyche*, some sonnets from *The Growth of Love* and an English Idyll—*Kate's Mother*—in the measure of *The Testament of Beauty*. There is nothing from *The Testament of Beauty* itself, as Bridges did not wish the poem to be used for anthologies. Among the lyrics are several of the best-known, but one regrets that those responsible for the choice have let it fall in general on poems of a convenient size, neither too short nor too long. Some of Bridges' most successful lyrics are but a few lines long, and these we miss.

A writer whose influence is to be found in poetry so different as that of Edward Thomas, Walter de la Mare, Yeats and W. H. Auden must always be interesting. It is strange that no full-length study of Bridges has yet appeared; his long and diligent career shows many points of contact and odd conjunctions with greater and less contemporaries. He is one of those writers who are interesting as much because of the

length of their lives as because of specific excellence. *The Testament of Beauty*, appearing in the middle of the period between the two wars, thus offered an opportunity for a changing England to reconsider the values of the later Victorian era. For the book was eventually an answer to the challenge, which Wordsworth had left to the Victorian poets—the challenge which required them, if they would be respected, to present a comprehensive but personal and improvised philosophy for the illumination of their fellow-citizens. Bridges finally faced what he accepted as a duty with the confident dexterity brought by a long poetical practice; he was intimately and publicly sustained by the prestige which age had brought him and by the consciousness of the many years he had spent in seclusion and literary contemplation. The result was a poem which, whatever may be thought to be its ultimate value, could not fail to illustrate the character of English intellectual life. It is not surprising that in the early 1930's Auden, himself improvising attitudes and systems in the manner traditional to English romantics, should have found a stimulus, which is sometimes more than technical in *The Testament of Beauty*.

Nevertheless it is certain that, if Bridges is remembered, it will be less for his most ambitious works than for his smaller poems. For many years they were the chief support of his reputation, and they have preserved a remarkable degree of freshness. There is in this poet a more than common distance between those poems which express his opinions and ideas—which rise more readily to the surface in later poems—and those which simply embody a moment of sensibility, a picture or an unusual rhythm. But the desire to present a framed elaborate picture, to invent a detailed luxurious object, uncommitted to a vision or a system, was as characteristic of Victorian poetry as the desire to preach or advertise. The one was probably the result of the other, though it would be a delicate taste to decide which took priority in any one poet or at any one time. This division of functions in any case brought about a certain impoverishment of both lyric and expository verse. The latter very often lacked fire, while the former lacked the pressure of intellectual content. A lack of excitement, of interesting measures, therefore marks Bridges' lyrics. With few exceptions, they do not *happen*, they are not events in the order either of the spirit, of everyday life or of English letters. Deliberate, exactly decorated and polished, his poetry is without the inner tension which gives vitality to much less admirable work. His diction is poetical, that is to say, as often as not, commonplace; and a weakness for the obvious or superfluous adjective seems to have been almost uncombated, though it became less dangerous as his increasing skill led him into greater metrical subtleties.

This skill was achieved by long application. Some of Bridges' most personal poems develop some other man's principle or triumph.

"London Snow", "A Passer-By", "On a Dead Child", to some extent follow Hopkins' notions of "sprung rhythm". But, while Hopkins arrived at his theories through the attempt to control and extend his very personal accent, whose idiosyncrasies could barely be kept within the limits he prescribed, Bridges had to make an effort, one feels, to go even as far as he went in imitation of his friend's daring. Only the high-pitched strain of Hopkins' temperament could justify the violent "inscapes" of his utterance. Bridges' attempt to adopt some of his methods may be compared to that which Cowley made to rival in smoother form the unstable complex brilliance of Donne's *Songs and Sonets*. But we must acknowledge that Bridges had enough good sense not to follow the oddities of Hopkins' syntax and thought (for the latter in any case he had no sympathy whatever). The poems most obviously affected by his friend's verse are therefore original creations; and they considerably extended the flexibility of his language.

One cannot adequately render the impression made by Bridges' poems without speaking of the poet's personality, for he accepted and worked a convention in which the poet's appeal must in the last resort be personal. Another period might have weaned him from some of his less attractive qualities—his detachment, coldness and self-absorption. But the circumstances of affluent Victorian culture protected these faults. As Verlaine said of Tennyson, he was "*trop noble, trop anglais*". He was Victorian both in his diffidence and in his self-assurance, in the conventionality of his judgements and in his "cranky" views on such matters as English spelling and prosody. When his opinions intrude on the lyrical world he created, one is forcibly struck by their ungraciousness. Nothing, for example, could be more ill-humoured than the reference to his old schoolmaster in "The Flycatchers" as full of "all manner of rubbish and all manner of lies". This priggishness, which took on a bearish tone as he grew older, crops out again and again in his verse and prose. It is a mark of weakness, like the destruction of his own side of the correspondence with Hopkins, and the desire that *The Testament of Beauty* should not be anthologized. Such a wish on the part of one who did not hesitate to present hundreds of snippets from great poets in *The Spirit of Man*—among them snatches from such delicately organized poems as "The Wreck of the Deutschland" and Rimbaud's last songs—gives the measure of his uneasy egoism. But the ugliness of these mistakes will fade, like the work which they marred. There will remain a handful of pure lyrics, enough to make it sure that he will be not only remembered, but read.

F. T. PRINCE.

Poems in Latin: together with a few Inscriptions. Compiled by John Sparrow. (Humphrey Milford. 6s.)

LIKE most anthologies of any interest at all, this book rouses pleasure and discontent almost equally. There is little in it which one would wish away, but its exclusion of Milton, Crashaw and Calverley seems regrettable, and there are opinions voiced in the preface which stir to contradiction.

The rather deceptively general title covers only poems by English hands of the last three centuries; and to limit the field still further, versions and imitations are banished in favour of original poems. This may seem a natural dichotomy, but I doubt if it is really justified. Originality and imitativeness in writing are in any case relative terms, and in this matter of Latin verse there are particular intricacies. For instance, were it not for external information, I think one might quite reasonably suppose Bryant's *Jam mihi canities* and Dr. Inge's *Filia non ullos* to be renderings of English originals; and on the other hand, it is surprising how personal a flavour may be found in the translations of a Paravicini or a J. B. Poynton. (Similarly it might be held that Rossetti's translation from Villon is more of a poem and a better poem than any of his original sonnets.)

Again, there is the delicate question of modern feeling beneath a classical idiom. Up to a point, a certain duality is pleasurable; but there comes a moment when Latinity gives place to "no language". I feel this about Gray's alcaics *O lachrymarum fons*, which to Horace surely would have been quite meaningless. In successful verse of this kind there is a plain surface meaning which an Augustan would have understood, while there are also overtones of modern association which enrich the whole thing for ourselves. Clearly there is better opportunity for experiment if the writer frankly abandons classicism and regards his verse as an extension of mediaeval Latin.

Divergency of opinion in such matters as these does not forbid real gratitude for a book which shelters under the same cover such contrasting small masterpieces as the seventeenth-century lyrics of Sidney Montagu, rhymed poems by Lionel Johnson, and Housman's superb dedication of Manilius, and which in a general way assembles a number of admirable things hitherto inconveniently dispersed.

WALTER SHEWRING.

Epitaph for Europe. By Paul Tabori. (Hodder & Stoughton. 8s. 6d. net.)

A Tale of Ten Cities. By George Sava. (Faber & Faber. 8s. 6d. net.)

THE contents of both these books and the title of the first leave us in no doubt about the fate of the Europe of 1918-1939. It is dead,

and, if we may legitimately hope that the evil heritage it has left will also rapidly disappear, we cannot but regret the passing of so much of the loveliness of these years which gave character to the period and inspired us who were then young with our noblest dreams. But the artistic achievements of the age were due to older men who had either done their best work before 1914 or learned their craft in more distant years. Paul Tabori writes in praise of the poems of Wildgans, Rilke and his countryman, Endre Ady; the last, however, died in 1919, Rilke in 1926, and Wildgans' finest poems were written in the midst of the war of 1914-18. He recalls Reinhardt's productions in Berlin, Moissi's acting in Salzburg, Toscanini's European triumphs. These, too, had been trained in a different world and were, for all their greatness, interpreters rather than creators. To these recollections might be added the production of *Rosenkavalier* in Vienna, in 1935, with Lehmann, Schumann, Nowotna, and Krenn. Is it likely that such a cast will ever assemble again for another twenty years? Hoffmannsthal, the author, was already dead, and Richard Strauss, the composer, went over to the Nazis. Or, still in the realm of interpretation, is there a voice or a presence on the English stage today comparable to those of Forbes-Robertson, who lived into the twenties, the last representative of a vanished age and an older fashion in theatrical art? The writers who inspired us, not, alas, to any nobler work, were also men of the past. We learned by heart the poetry of Yeats, his burning, passionate, youthful poetry written in the nineteenth century (and in the form it *then* took, without the unfortunate corrections of the mature years); we admired the superb prose of Hilaire Belloc but did not succeed in writing with the same direct simplicity. But we *were* active, we younger ones, actively writing about our very bewilderment and trying to fuse politics and literature, with disastrous results for literature. We were the Communists of Bloomsbury, the ardent Fascists of Italy, the disillusioned and unemployed Nazi university students.

Insecurity was the keynote of those years, between the wars, and the success of the "isms" and the poverty of literature were due alike to our efforts to overcome it. Sava puts the whole situation in a nutshell: "The working-class intellectual proletariat tends towards Communism as a solution of their problem, whilst the intellectual proletariat, whose roots are in the middle-classes, but not their fortunes, tend towards something which will give them back their middle-class 'dignity' and security. Among these will the Fascists be found." There was also hatred, a mean sub-human hatred, far removed from the equally undesirable but more boisterous and, in a sense, more pure hatred of past times. Tabori's clear-sighted informant expressed the meaning of it in Hungary and Europe: "People hate in order to get a job in which they can make an extra

pound a week : they hate, almost selflessly, in order to prevent some one else from earning that extra pound ; they hate because they cannot tolerate beauty or youth, success or talent. . . . In teashops strangers stare at each other as if they were Guelphs and Ghibellines."

Nevertheless youth cannot be blamed entirely for the hatred and insecurity of the period. They were as much a heritage of the past as the beauty. For the creation of this and the training of the artists was made financially possible through a system which admitted gross social inequalities, giving rise to strife, uncertainty, and finally to a general upheaval. Tabori, passionately in love with the Europe he so charmingly describes, does not hesitate to give the complete picture, including his own experience of sordid poverty and near-destitution. The underpaid factory workers of Roubaix, the exploited peasants of Mezökövesd, were not perhaps necessary in order that we might be touched by "careful strains of art", but in fact their sufferings were a part of the price paid for our aesthetic pleasures.

I fear I have yielded to two temptations, the one to which my profession inclines me, to use this review as an excuse for preaching a sermon, and the other the inclination of the older type of young man to indulge in reminiscences. I must hastily do penance by assuring readers of much delightful and enlightening observation in *A Tale of Ten Cities*, with a piquant description of Hitler's visit to a psycho-analyst ; even if the story seems very unlikely, it is worth reading for its shrewd judgements on the origins of Nazism.

Some indication of the contents of *Epitaph for Europe* has already been given, but the spirit in which it is written is even more important and attractive. The author, like so many of his contemporaries, has abandoned the faith of his childhood and he has no illusions about the evil potentialities of human nature. But he is never cynical, only resigned ; he has lived greatly in a mean age and he looks forward with courage to the future.

EDWARD QUINN.

The Keys of the Kingdom. By Dr. Cronin. (Gollancz. 9s. net).

FRANCIS CHISHOLM was left an orphan at the age of nine. He was brought up by his uncle, Ned Bannon, proprietor of the "Union Tavern" in Tynecastle, sent by him to the Church school of Holywell, presided over by Sandy Mac. Thence he went to the English seminary in Spain of San Morales, and at last, after a career in which he was at one time within measurable distance of expulsion, he received his ordination. He served in two Tynecastle parishes and then on the

suggestion of Sandy Mac, by that time the Bishop, volunteered for the China mission. It was in China at the little distant station of Pai-tan that he spent the greater part of his working life and with which the greater part of this book is concerned. At last, after an apostolate there that was not, judged by purely external standards, spectacular, he returned to his native Tynecastle a broken and eccentric man and finished out his days as the parish priest of his little native village. The ecclesiastical authorities were in doubt whether he should be allowed to remain in his parish—partly because of his eccentricities and his simplicity and partly because of the allegedly latitudinarian unorthodoxy of some of his statements, but in the end Monsignor Sleeth is conquered by that very simplicity and reports in his favour.

The novel is written with a somewhat obvious eye on the film rights and indeed reads even in its literary form a little like a scenario. It has a slick competence of form that contrasts a little amusingly with the theme that bids us find grace beneath an apparently graceless exterior. These, however, are but minor criticisms, and criticism of a work of art should be concerned rather with the result than the motive. Of the success of this book and of the good that that success will do there can be little doubt. There will be some who will read it for its vivid pictures of Chinese life which the author knows so well, and these are indeed memorable. But his real triumph is a deeper one than that. He tells us of a man whose only quality is holiness and succeeds in showing both that holiness makes a man interesting and also that, superficially unattractive as it often is, it does in the end conquer all those who are compelled to attend to it. Father Tarrant at the seminary, Mother Maria-Veronica, the proud and high-born German nun, Monsignor Sleeth at the last—all eventually fall before him. It is true that Bishop Mealey remains unconquered, but it would be unfair to argue that that sprang from a total deficiency in him, for he never allowed his attention to be truly captured.

It is a difficult theme which Dr. Cronin has set himself. His book is predominantly concerned with clerics, and there will, I suppose, be some who complain that his pictures of clerical life are not altogether flattering. The complaint would be a foolish one. It is easy enough to say that holiness is a lovely quality and that he who possesses it has all other graces added to him, but the whole tragedy of history comes from the fact that it is not easily recognized nor easily loved. It is not easily loved partly because of the lack of single-mindedness in those to whom it is presented. We turn from that which is a rebuke to ourselves and hate that which would tear us from those things upon which our affections are set. But, apart from that, while holiness is itself a lovely thing, the struggle to achieve it is not, save in the rarest cases, attractive. There are few souls so balanced that they can win

